

Lenin on language



Raduga Publishers
Moscow

В И ЧЕНИН О ЯЗЫКЕ

На английском языке

CONTENTS

Preface	5
I The essence and laws of the development of language	17
II Language and thought	17
III Language and the class struggle	45
IV The national question and language policy	94
V Words and their meaning revealing the content of certain concepts and terms	160
VI On style and norms of language	208
VII On translation	242
VIII On speech culture	250
Appendix	255
a) General culture questions	255
b) Dictionaries and libraries	258
c) Lenin's knowledge of languages	264
Notes	268
Name index	285

PREFACE

In the present collection the reader will find extracts from Lenin's works, which deal directly or indirectly with the essence of language, its development, its links with thought, and its role in the political struggle.

V. I. Lenin (Ulyanov) received a classical education in the humanities, which at that time was considered prestigious. It was thought that a knowledge of classical languages was necessary to penetrate the world of ideas, to master the principles of logical thinking, syllogistic, etc. Much attention was paid to philological culture, so we should not be surprised that in the works of Lenin, as in the works of Plekhanov, Lunacharsky and other Russian Marxist intellectuals of the first generation, we find so many interesting ideas, opinions and remarks on philological and linguistic questions.

Lenin's profound philological culture manifests itself in the language and style of his own writings, of course. His profound understanding of the essence, functions and specific features of language in general, and the Russian language in particular, can be seen from his expressive lines, no matter what subject they treat.

The language of Lenin's works is a most important phenomenon in the history of the Russian literary language, a classical model of Russian scholarly and publicistic writing of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. His works elucidate fully the problems of dialectical and historical materialism, political economy and scientific communism.

Lenin's works, studied by each successive generation, exert a great influence on present-day usage, terminological work and speech culture. Lenin provided some brilliant examples of the use of language in the ideological struggle. This explains why the writings of Lenin, the great politician and thinker, are studied by linguists as well as by politicians,

economists and philosophers.

The main features of Lenin's individual style developed fairly early. In general, the changing of Ulyanov the student into Lenin the theoretician of Marxism was a rapid one.

A fine example of the creative application of Marxism to Russian reality and a model of the scientific style of exposition is Lenin's *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* (1894). It is in this work that Lenin laid the foundations of his scientific theoretical style, mastered the polemical devices of Marx and Engels and the Russian revolutionary democrats, and demonstrated the effective use of the resources of the literary language. Here we find precise, clear, comprehensible and expressive scientific exposition, political ardour, and revolutionary élan.

Lenin was critical of the theories of epistemology widespread in his day. In particular, he noted that the theory of symbols of Helmholtz, one of the most eminent naturalists of the nineteenth century, introduced "entirely unnecessary element of agnosticism" into epistemology (see p. 22). The theories of the Vienna logical positivists (Wittgenstein and others) with their exaggerated attention to language aroused Lenin's reasoned objections. As for the nature of language, general semantics and social psychology, the extracts from Lenin's works in the present collection will convince the reader that by the beginning of this century Lenin not only gave a Marxist formulation to diverse functional transformations of words in the ideological struggle, but also produced works, the language and style of which almost suggest that he had read the latest works of our day on the influence of speech, social psychology and the psychology of communication.

For Lenin language, speech, words were not ends in themselves. Words as catalysts of the historical acts of the people—this for Lenin was the highest manifestation of the essence of language. This explains Lenin's hatred of the empty and harmful phrase.

As we know, the teaching of the founders of scientific communism provides a theoretical and methodological basis for any branch of scientific knowledge. This also applies fully to linguistics, which deals with the complex interaction of material and ideal elements in the object of its study—human language. By virtue of its social essence and social

function, language is not and cannot be an independent realm: it is indissolubly linked with thought, social consciousness and objective reality, which is both the first cause of linguistic nomination and also the social environment, the needs of which language serves.

In their writings and personal correspondence the classics of Marxism-Leninism repeatedly gave the materialist interpretation of the essence of language as a specific social phenomenon, and expressed their opinions on the most important questions of general linguistics and the role of linguistic factors for a correct solution of the national question.

All his life Lenin took an interest in linguistic questions and supplemented his linguistic knowledge. His sister Anna, recalling Lenin's passion for languages at the gymnasium, wrote: "He was not the top boy who diligently learnt his lessons, he was rather a *young linguist* capable of finding the special features and beauty of the language." Later Lenin made frequent use of his knowledge of Greek and Latin. After taking the path of revolutionary struggle, Lenin patiently and methodically mastered German, French and English, which was in keeping with the tasks of the political struggle of the working class and its party. In 1889-90, while living in Samara (now Kuibyshev), Lenin translated *The Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels from German. Unfortunately this translation has not survived. The present collection contains material that illustrates his fine command of foreign languages. Lenin knew German and French perfectly. His speech at the Communist International Congress in 1920, which he delivered first in Russian, then in German, and finally in French, made a tremendous impression on the delegates.

Lenin was well informed about the linguistic situation in Europe and Asia. In 1913 he noted in his Plans for an Essay on the National Question: "Crankiness (the Provençal language in France and attempts to revive it)" (see p. 112). He paid special attention to scientific literature on linguistic relations in Switzerland.

Of the Slavonic languages Lenin could read Ukrainian and Polish and he also studied Bulgarian. About the Czech language he wrote as early as 1901: "I am sorry I have not studied Czech. It is interesting that it is very much like Polish

and contains many old Russian words. I recently went away for a time and when I returned to Prague its Slav character struck me very forcibly—names ending in *-čik, -ček*, etc., words like *lze, lekarna*, and so on and so forth" (see p. 266).

Thus, Lenin's vast personal knowledge and fluent mastery of a number of West European languages, his reading of scientific literature, his detailed information about linguistic relations, particularly in multi-national and multi-linguistic states, enabled him to form opinions on linguistic questions easily and knowledgeably.

Although, as has already been noted, Lenin took a lively interest in linguistic problems, he did not leave any specifically linguistic works behind him. Consequently his understanding of the nature of language and his analysis of individual linguistic questions are to be found in connection with more general philosophical, sociological, economic and political problems. An analysis of Lenin's statements on language, on the history of its development, on the relation of language and thought, on the use of language in the ideological struggle, and on the taking into account of linguistic features in solving the national question, and an understanding of his remarks on matters of terminology, the meaning of words, speech culture, style and questions of translation are of great importance.

Naturally not only Lenin's direct statements on questions of language are important for materialist linguistics. Marxist-Leninist philosophy, the materialist interpretation of the nature of language, and the dialectical materialist approach to the study of language and its categories are all of paramount importance for the creative development of linguistics. Lenin's method of scientific research is the starting point in assessing the epistemological principles of the different linguistic schools and trends which treat the essence of language and its relation to thought and to non-linguistic activity in an idealist way.

Lenin lived and worked in different socio-historical conditions from those of Marx and Engels. Marx and Engels, in laying the foundations of the materialist view of society and attacking the idealist view of consciousness as spirit free from the matter of nature, were asserting the primacy of matter: thought does not exist on its own, it is embodied in natural material form, in language (language is the direct reality of

thought). The founders of Marxism asserted that language and consciousness were genetically akin in their social character: language and consciousness arose in order to satisfy the human need for communication. Finally, Marx and Engels drew particular attention to the fact that "neither thoughts nor language in themselves form a realm of their own, that they are only *manifestations* of actual life".* In Lenin's works we find the development of the views of Marx and Engels on language and consciousness, the profound substantiation of the materialist dialectics and the defence of the latter against the opportunists, and the solution of practical tasks of the proletarian revolution, the national question and the building of socialist society. Basing himself on the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels, Lenin creatively developed Marxist theory in the sphere of philosophy and scientific communism, substantiated many theoretical and practical propositions that constitute the initial principles of the national policy of the CPSU and its attitude to linguistic problems in the period of the construction of socialism and communism.

Lenin's theory of knowledge with its main element, the theory of reflection, elaborated in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* and the *Philosophical Notebooks*, is of prime importance for Marxist linguistics. It enables us to understand correctly the relationship of language and society, language and thought, the dialectical unity of linguistic content and form, the correlation of the material and semantic elements of linguistic phenomena, the problem of the semiotic nature of linguistic units, and the essence of linguistic abstraction.

In elaborating the theory of knowledge and deepening the principles of dialectics, Lenin brilliantly sensed the general tendency towards the integration, drawing together of the different scientific disciplines. He noted the striving of science to study different structures in nature and society and the elements of which they are composed: "...a powerful current ... from natural to social science ... remains just as powerful, if not more so, in the twentieth century too" (see p. 24). The links which linguistics has firmly established with semiotics, cybernetics, information theory, and so on, testify to the correctness of Lenin's statement.

* K. Marx and F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 447.—*Ed.*

Lenin advanced the requirement of taking into account the universal link of phenomena, the link of all the elements of the structure, as one of the basic principles of dialectics. In his conspectus of Hegel's *Science of Logic*, Lenin wrote: "In the old logic there is no transition, development (of concept and thought), there is not '*eines inneren, notwendigen Zusammenhangs*'* (43) of all the parts and '*Übergang*'**" of some parts into others.

And Hegel puts forward two basic requirements:

1) 'The necessity of connection'

and

2) 'the immanent emergence of distinctions.'

Very important!! this is what it means, in my opinion:

1. *Necessary* connection, the objective connection of all the aspects, forces, tendencies, etc., of the given sphere of phenomena;

2. the '*immanent emergence* of distinctions'—the inner objective logic of evolution and of the struggle of the differences, polarity" (see p. 30).

Lenin writes "subtle and profound" in the margin when quoting Hegel's formulation: "Logic resembles grammar, being one thing for the beginner and another thing for one who knows the language (and languages) and the spirit of language. 'It is one thing to him who approaches Logic and the Sciences in general for the first time and another thing for him who comes back from the sciences to Logic'" (see p. 30). This is familiar to those who study languages, for the initial stage is not mastery of the structure of the language, but merely certain information about the elements of the structure. Full mastery of a language (and subject) means making use of the whole structure of the language, applying it creatively.

We would point out here that the lively discussion of the problem of structure in philosophy is linked with the linguistics which stimulated this problem, with the activity of Baudouin de Courtenay, Ferdinand de Saussure and also the sociologist Emile Durkheim.

In many passages of his *Philosophical Notebooks*, Lenin, speaking of the dialectical unity of the particular and the

* an inner, necessary connection—*Ed.*

**"transition"—*Ed.*

general, points to the tremendous importance of language for the development of thought, remarks on contradictions in language, mentions the correlation of the sensual and rational (abstract) elements, and points to the possibility of the imagination losing touch with life. In listing the spheres of knowledge from which the theory of knowledge should be constructed, Lenin stresses the importance of language for cognising the reality around us: alongside the history of the individual sciences he places the *history of language* (see p. 40).

At the same time Lenin was dubious of a number of general philosophical and general linguistic theses current in his day. Thus, for example, Haym's statement that "the critique of reason must become the criticism of language" which became the foundation of Vienna neo-positivism did not meet with his approval. The thesis "the history of thought=the history of language" was immediately furnished with two question marks. In this connection Hegel's statement, "The connection between thought and language (the Chinese language, incidentally, and its lack of development)", did not meet with his approval either. And Hegel's remark "Language is richer among peoples in undeveloped, primitive state— language becomes poorer with the advance of civilisation and the development of grammar" (see pp. 28, 39) is also accompanied by a question mark.

Lenin was the founder of the socio-linguistic approach to language, language policy and language development. In his works on nations and national relations he solved the problem of the relationship of language and nation, revealed the conditions of the functioning of language in a class society, and elaborated the problem of the existence of two cultures in the life of each capitalist nation with their reactionary, bourgeois and progressive, socialist elements. In his works Lenin pinpointed the causes of the influence of language on the working people and on social strata in general (the pragmatic function of language), and the need to take account of national linguistic traditions was also widely reflected in his statements. Lenin himself was an unsurpassed master of making effective use of the Russian language in the ideological struggle, in exposing the verbiage of reactionaries, liberals, and opportunists and in Party propaganda and agitation among the working masses.

Many of Lenin's remarks on the history of the development of the Russian language are linked with an analysis of Russia's historical development. Lenin was interested in all the periods of Russian history, but he paid most attention to the last three centuries, connected with the emergence and development of capitalist relations within feudalism. Lenin linked the beginning of the formation of the Russian national language with the centralisation of the lands in the Moscovite state, with the emergence of a national market. Lenin's remarks on the distinguishing features between the seventeenth-century monarchy with its Boyar Council, the absolutism of the eighteenth century, and the autocracy of the nineteenth century (see p. 18) are of great importance for linguists. Lenin's division of the Russian emancipation movement into periods, his analysis of the social forces acting before and after the abolition of serfdom in 1861, and the general increase in the sense of the individual have a direct bearing on the problem of the development of the Russian language, its democratisation, and the development of Russian culture and literature.

In his work "Critical Remarks on the National Question" Lenin revealed two tendencies that exist in the national question under capitalism: "The first is the awakening of national life and national movements, the struggle against all national oppression, and the creation of national states. The second is the development and growing frequency of international intercourse in every form, the break-down of national barriers, the creation of the international unity of capital, of economic life in general, of politics, science, etc." (see p. 115). In taking into account concrete historical conditions, Marxists are bound to struggle for national equality and at the same time to thwart all attempts to infect the proletariat with the poison of bourgeois nationalism.

Lenin fought tirelessly for national equality, for the right of each nation to self-determination, for its right to develop its own culture, its own language. He was opposed to the imposing by force of a single state language and consistently supported proletarian internationalism.

After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution the peoples acquired freedom of national and linguistic development in the Soviet Union. As a result of the fraternal collaboration of the socialist nations, Russian became, without

any coercive measures, the second native language for the broad masses of the national and autonomous republics and regions of the Soviet state, the language of international communication of the peoples of the Land of the Soviets.

Lenin loved the Russian language, and admired its greatness, power and force. He often turned to dictionaries of the Russian language and had an excellent knowledge of popular speech. Lenin guarded correct Russian, he was highly sensitive to even the smallest linguistic inaccuracies, to the slightest deviations from the norms of the Russian literary language, and opposed the distortion of Russian and the unjustified use of loan words. Lenin contributed greatly to the creation of Russian socio-political and philosophical terminology. It must be noted that in modern dictionaries of the Russian language the explanations of many of these terms are based on Lenin's definitions. In general, Lenin paid great attention to defining the meaning of many Russian words. His striving for clarity and precision of exposition, for the ideal of the literary language, also explains his unflagging interest in the compilation of a dictionary of the modern Russian "from Pushkin to Gorky".

Lenin was most exacting of the language and style of agitation and propaganda. He demanded that the language of articles and books should be impeccable. He was equally exacting of himself, working hard on the language of his own manuscripts and speeches, seeking to make use of the language's means of expression, its rich vocabulary and syntax.

Lenin regarded publicists as annalists who passed on the experience acquired in the struggle to those who took an active part in events. Therefore, he saw the chief qualities of publicistics to be an angry tone and passion, taking account of the readership, choosing the most effective means of influencing it and deep commitment to the Party.

Lenin highly assessed oratory. He was a true tribune of the people. Before him history had not known a politician who made such effective use of the spoken word in the interests of the revolutionary transformation of society. Lenin the orator is inseparable from Lenin the thinker, publicist and organiser. He distinguished between polemics with like-minded people and enemies. Veracity, concreteness, a link with social practice, an analysis of the situation, clarity and

knowledge of one's audience—this is what Lenin expected from the orator. He was the enemy of stereotypes and clichés in oral addresses.

What has been said above about Lenin's attitude to philosophical questions: matter and spirit, being and consciousness, language and thought, the dialectical method, his theory of proletarian culture and the national question, and his attitude to the language of political propaganda and agitation—has determined the composition of the present volume.

It is divided into the following sections: 1) The essence and laws of the development of language; 2) Language and thought; 3) Language and the class struggle; 4) The national question and language policy; 5) Words and their meaning; revealing the content of certain concepts and terms; 6) On style and norms of language; 7) On translation; and 8) On speech culture.

Autobiographical information on Lenin's study of foreign languages, his attention to the scientific organisational aspect of philology and the humanities in general (his notes on N. Rubakin's book *Among the Books*, Lenin's views on libraries and dictionaries) (see pp. 262-63), which found expression in notes, enquiries, instructions, etc., and also certain statements of a general cultural nature are contained in the appendix.

Lenin's opinions that may be classified under the above-listed sections, occasionally appear in a real, broad context inseparably linked with other themes and subjects. Therefore, one and the same idea could have been classified in a different way, that is, put in a different section. In the case of important propositions quotations are repeated (rarely) in several sections.

It must be noted that indirect references to language, words, their precision and effectiveness, etc., rather than direct references, are often characteristic of Lenin. This means that the compiler is unable to group all the quotations within each section under detailed sub-headings.

All the extracts from Lenin's works in the present collection are in chronological order.

The limits of the extracts have been determined by their meaning, but if the reader turns to the broader context, to

the full text of this or that work by Lenin, he will have a more concrete idea of the place of the given idea in the overall composition of Lenin's work.

Most of Lenin's remarks on language, the meanings of foreign, popular or colloquial words, the content of concepts and terms, as has already been mentioned, are of an incidental nature, like remarks made in passing, therefore the context will help the reader to understand in what connection this or that remark was made, and this or that linguistic or philological idea expressed.

An example of this is Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks* which contain conspectuses of philosophical works with Lenin's remarks and theses in the margin and the main text. These can be understood only from the context or if one knows the event about which they were made (see, for example, the item on the national question).

* * *

The book contains notes and a name index. The notes explain the names of parties and groups, newspapers and journals, congresses and conferences, political events, institutions, etc., mentioned in the text. The translations are taken from the English edition of V. I. Lenin's *Collected Works* in 45 volumes prepared by Progress Publishers, Moscow, except where otherwise noted.

Corrections have been made in accordance with the Fifth Russian Edition of the *Collected Works*.

P. I. Denisov,
N. A. Kondrashov

I. THE ESSENCE AND LAWS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGE

II. LANGUAGE AND THOUGHT

Mr. Mikhailovsky gives another factual reference—and this too is a gem in its way! “As regards gentile ties,” he says, continuing to put materialism right, “they paled in the history of civilised peoples partly, it is true, under the rays of the influence of the forms of production” (another subterfuge, only more obvious still. Exactly what forms of production? An empty phrase!), “but partly they became dissolved in their own continuation and generalisation—in national ties.” And so, national ties are a continuation and generalisation of gentile ties! Mr. Mikhailovsky, evidently, borrows his ideas on the history of society from the tales taught to school children. The history of society—this copybook maxim runs—is that first there was the family, that nucleus of every society,* then—we are told—the family grew into the tribe, and the tribe grew into the state. If Mr. Mikhailovsky with a solemn air repeats this childish nonsense, it merely shows—apart from everything else—that he has not the slightest notion of the course taken even by Russian history. While one might speak of gentile life in ancient Rus, there can be no doubt that by the Middle Ages, the era of the Moscovite tsars, these gentile ties no longer existed, that is to say, the state was based on associations that were not gentile at all, but local: the landlords and the monasteries acquired peasants from various localities, and the communities thus formed were purely territorial associa-

* This is a purely bourgeois idea: separate, small families came to predominate only under the bourgeois regime; they were entirely non-existent in prehistoric times. Nothing is more characteristic of the bourgeois than the application of the features of the modern system to all times and peoples.

tions. But one could hardly speak of national ties in the true sense of the term at that time: the state split into separate "lands", sometimes even principalities, which preserved strong traces of the former autonomy, peculiarities of administration, at times their own troops (the local boyars went to war at the head of their own companies), their own tariff frontiers, and so forth. Only the modern period of Russian history (approximately from the seventeenth century) is characterised by the actual amalgamation of all such regions, lands and principalities into one whole. This amalgamation, most esteemed Mr. Mikhailovsky, was brought about not by gentile ties, nor even by their continuation and generalisation: it was brought about by the increasing exchange among regions, the gradually growing circulation of commodities, and the concentration of the small local markets into a single, all-Russian market. Since the leaders and masters of this process were the merchant capitalists, the creation of these national ties was nothing else than the creation of bourgeois ties.

*What the Friends of the People" Are
and How They Fight the Social-Democrats,
Vol 1, pp. 154-55*

...In reality autocracy, constitutional monarchy and republic are merely different forms of class struggle; and the dialectics of history are such that each of these forms passes through different stages of development of its class content, and the transition from one form to another does not (in itself) at all eliminate the rule of the former exploiting classes under the new integument. For instance, the Russian autocracy of the seventeenth century with its Boyar Council and boyar aristocracy bears no resemblance to the autocracy of the eighteenth century with its bureaucracy, its ranks and orders of society, and its occasional periods of "enlightened absolutism"; while both differ sharply from the autocracy of the nineteenth century, which was compelled to emancipate the peasants "from above", although pauperising them in the process, paving the way for capitalism, introducing the principle of local representative institutions for the bourgeoisie. By the twentieth century this last form of

semi-feudal, semi-patriarchal absolutism had also become obsolete. Owing to the growth of capitalism and the increase in the power of the bourgeoisie, etc., it became necessary to introduce representative institutions on a national scale. The revolutionary struggle of 1905 became particularly acute around the issue as to who was to convene the first all-Russian representative institution, and how. ...

*How the Socialist-Revolutionaries Sum
Up the Revolution and How the Revolution
Has Summed Them Up*, Vol. 15,
p. 337

28. Economic foundations? Capitalism demands consolidation of domestic market. The market is the centre of commercial relations. *Language* is the chief instrument of human commercial relations.

*Theses for a Lecture on the National
Question*, Vol. 41, p. 314

.. Language is the most important means of human intercourse. Unity and unimpeded development of language are the most important conditions for genuinely free and extensive commerce on a scale commensurate with modern capitalism, for a free and broad grouping of the population in all its various classes and, lastly, for the establishment of a close connection between the market and each and every proprietor, big or little, and between seller and buyer.

Therefore, the tendency of every national movement is towards the formation of *national states*, under which these requirements of modern capitalism are best satisfied.

*The Right of Nations to Self-
Determination*, Vol. 20, p. 396

FROM COMMENTS ON DIEI7GFN'S
BOOK *MINOR PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS*

The concept of matter and the material still remains a very confused one. Just as lawyers cannot agree on when the life of a child in its mother's womb begins, or as

linguists argue about where language begins—whether the call or the love song of a bird is language or not, and whether one should include the language of mimicry and gesture in the same category as articulate speech or not—in precisely the same way

NB materialists of the old mechanistic school argue about what is matter: should this concept include only that which is tangible and ponderable or everything that is seen, smelled and heard and, finally, all nature. is material for research and consequently everything can be called material, even the human spirit, for this object, too, serves as material for the theory of knowledge.

Thus, the feature which distinguishes the mechanistic materialists of the last century from Social-Democratic materialists schooled in German idealism is that the latter have extended the limited concept of *only tangible* matter to everything material in general.

Philosophical Notebooks, V. I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, Fifth Russian Edition, p. 434

3) In the theory of knowledge, as in every other sphere of science, we must think dialectically, that is, we must not regard our knowledge as ready-made and unalterable, but must determine how *knowledge* emerges from *ignorance*, how incomplete, inexact knowledge becomes more complete and more exact.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Vol. 14, p. 103

Bogdanov, pretending to argue only against Belov and cravenly ignoring Engels, is indignant at such definitions,¹ which, don't you see, "prove" to be simple repetitions" (*Empirio-monism*, Bk. III, p. 23) of the "formula" (of Engels, our "Marxist" forgets to add) that for one trend in philosophy matter is primary and spirit secondary, while for

the other trend the reverse is the case. All the Russian Machists² exultantly echo Bogdanov's "refutation"! But the slightest reflection could have shown these people that it is impossible, in the very nature of the case, to give any definition of these two ultimate concepts of epistemology, except an indication which of them is taken as primary. What is meant by giving a "definition"? It means essentially to bring a given concept within a more comprehensive concept. For example, when I give the definition "an ass is an animal", I am bringing the concept "ass" within a more comprehensive concept. The question then is, are there more comprehensive concepts with which the theory of knowledge could operate than those of being and thinking, matter and sensation, physical and mental? No. These are the ultimate, most comprehensive concepts, which epistemology has in point of fact so far not surpassed (apart from changes in *nomenclature*, which are *always* possible). One must be a charlatan or an utter blockhead to demand a "definition" of these two series of concepts of ultimate comprehensiveness which would not be a "mere repetition": one or the other must be taken as primary.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, p. 146

...Engels takes the knowledge and will of man, on the one hand, and the necessity of nature, on the other, and instead of giving any definitions, simply says that the necessity of nature is primary, and human will and mind secondary. The latter must necessarily and inevitably adapt themselves to the former....

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, p. 188

...The theory of symbols³ cannot be reconciled with such a view (which, as we have seen, is wholly materialist), for it implies a certain distrust of perception, a distrust of the evidence of our sense-organs. It is beyond doubt that an image can never wholly compare with the model, but an image is one thing, a symbol, a *conventional sign*, another. The image inevitably and of necessity implies the objective reality of that which it "images". "Conventional sign",

symbol, hieroglyph are concepts which introduce an entirely unnecessary element of agnosticism.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, p. 235

...That both thought and matter are "real", i.e., exist, is true. But to say that thought is material is to make a false step, a step towards confusing materialism and idealism. Basically, this is more an inexact expression of Dietzgen's, who elsewhere correctly says: "Mind and matter at least have this in common, that they exist" (80). "Thinking," says Dietzgen, "is a work of the body.... In order to think I require a substance that can be thought of. This substance is provided in the phenomena of nature and life.... Matter is the boundary of the mind, beyond which the latter cannot pass.... Mind is a product of matter, but matter is more than a product of mind..." (64).

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, p. 244

...That the conception of "matter" must also include thoughts, as Dietzgen repeats in the *Excursions* (op. cit., p. 214), is a muddle, for if such an inclusion is made, the epistemological contrast between mind and matter, idealism and materialism, a contrast upon which Dietzgen himself insists, loses all meaning. That this contrast must not be made "excessive", exaggerated, metaphysical, is beyond dispute (and it is the great merit of the *dialectical* materialist Dietzgen that he emphasised this). The limits of the absolute necessity and absolute truth of this relative contrast are precisely those limits which define *the trend* of epistemological investigations. To operate beyond these limits with the antithesis of matter and mind, physical and mental, as though they were absolute opposites, would be a great mistake.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, pp. 245-46

..."Matter disappears" means that the limit within which we have hitherto known matter disappears and that our knowledge is penetrating deeper; properties of matter are likewise disappearing which formerly seemed absolute, immutable, and primary (impenetrability, inertia, mass, etc.)

and which are now revealed to be relative and characteristic only of certain states of matter. For the *sole* "property" of matter with whose recognition philosophical materialism is bound up is the property of *being an objective reality*, of existing outside the mind.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 11, pp. 260-61

"...The most exact definition would, perhaps, be the following: 'matter is what moves'; but this is as devoid of content as though one were to say that matter is the subject of a sentence, the predicate of which is 'moves'. The fact, most likely, is that in the epoch of statics men were wont to see something necessarily solid in the role of the subject, an 'object', and such an inconvenient thing for statical thought as 'motion' they were prepared to tolerate only as a predicate, as one of the attributes of 'matter'."

This is something like the charge Akimov brought against the Iskrists,⁴ namely, that their programme did not contain the word proletariat in the nominative case! Whether we say the world is moving matter, or that the world is material motion, makes no difference whatever.

"...But energy must have a vehicle—say those who believe in matter. Why?—asks Ostwald, and with reason. Must nature necessarily consist of subject and predicate?" (P. 39.)

Ostwald's answer, which so pleased Bogdanov in 1899, is plain sophistry. Must our judgements necessarily consist of electrons and ether?—one might retort to Ostwald. As a matter of fact, the mental elimination from "nature" of matter as the "subject" only implies the tacit admission into *philosophy of thought* as the "subject" (i.e., as the primary, the starting-point, independent of matter). Not the subject, but the objective source of sensation is eliminated, and *sensation* becomes the "subject", i.e., philosophy becomes Berkeleian, no matter in what trappings the word "sensation" is afterwards decked. Ostwald endeavoured to avoid this inevitable philosophical alternative (materialism or idealism) by an indefinite use of the word "energy", but this very endeavour only once again goes to prove the futility of such artifices. If energy is motion, you have only shifted the difficulty from the subject to the predicate, you have only changed the question, does matter move? into the question,

is energy material? Does the transformation of energy take place outside my mind, independently of man and mankind, or are these only ideas, symbols, conventional signs, and so forth? And this question proved fatal to the "energeticist" philosophy, that attempt to disguise old epistemological errors by a "new" terminology.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, pp. 270-71

...The destructibility of the atom, its inexhaustibility, the mutability of all forms of matter and of its motion, have always been the stronghold of dialectical materialism. All boundaries in nature are conditional, relative, movable, and express the gradual approximation of our mind towards knowledge of matter. But this does not in any way prove that nature, matter itself, is a symbol, a conventional sign, i.e., the product of our mind.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, p. 281

...Social being and social consciousness are not identical, just as being in general and consciousness in general are not identical. From the fact that in their intercourse men act as conscious beings, it *does not follow* at all that social consciousness is identical with social being. In all social formations of any complexity—and in the capitalist social formation in particular—people in their intercourse are *not conscious* of what kind of social relations are being formed, in accordance with what laws they develop, etc.... Social consciousness *reflects* social being—that is Marx's teaching. A reflection may be an approximately true copy of the reflected, but to speak of identity is absurd. Consciousness in general *reflects* being—that is a general thesis of *all* materialism. It is impossible not to see its direct and *inseparable* connection with the thesis of historical materialism: social consciousness *reflects* social being.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, p. 323

...a powerful current ... from natural to social science ... remains just as powerful, if not more so, in the twentieth century too.

Socialism Demolished Again, Vol. 20,
p. 196

...There are *no* "pure" phenomena, nor can there be, either in Nature or in society—that is what Marxist dialectics teaches us, for dialectics shows that the very concept of purity indicates a certain narrowness, a one-sidedness of human cognition, which cannot embrace an object in all its totality and complexity.

The Collapse of the Second International,
Vol. 21, p. 236

FROM THE CONSPECIUS OF FEUERBACH'S BOOK
*LECTURES ON THE ESSENCE OF RELIGION*⁵

"Man separates in thought the adjective from the substantive, the property from the essence.... And the metaphysical God is nothing but the compendium, the totality of the most general properties extracted from nature, which, however, man by means of the force of imagination—and indeed in just this separation from sensuous being, matter of nature—reconverts into an independent subject or being." (417)

NB
profoundly
correct!
NB

The same role is played by *Logic* ((418)—obviously Hegel is meant)—which converts *das Sein, das Wesen** into a special reality—"how stupid it is to want to make metaphysical existence into a physical one, subjective existence into an objective one, and again logical or abstract existence into an illogical real existence!" (418)

Excellent
(against
Hegel and
idealism)

..."Is there, therefore, an eternal gulf and contradiction between being and thinking?' Yes, but only in the mind; however in reality the contradiction has long been resolved, to be sure only in a way corresponding to reality and not to your school notions, and, indeed, resolved by not fewer than five senses." (418)

beautifully
said!

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38, p. 81

* being, essence—*Ed.*

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF FEUERBACH'S BOOK
LECTURES ON THE ESSENCE OF RELIGION

- NB 431-435. A good quotation from Gassendi.
A very good passage: especially 433
God=a collection of adjectival words
(without matter) about the concrete
and the abstract.

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38, p 81

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF FEUERBACH'S BOOK
ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF LEIBNITZ

- bien dit!
- NB . ||| Leibnitz in *Nouveaux essais*: "Generality
consists in the resemblance to each other of
individual things, and this resemblance is a
reality" (Book III, Chapter 3, § 12). "But is
this resemblance then not sensuous truth?
Do not the beings which the understanding
refers to a *single* class, a *single* genus, affect
also my senses in an identical, equal man-
ner?... What then is the difference between
the faculty of understanding and that of
sensuous perception or sensation? The
senses present the *thing*, but the understand-
ing adds the *name* to it. There is nothing in
the understanding that is not in sensuous
perception, but what is found in the sensu-
ous perception in fact is in the understand-
ing only in name. The understanding is the
highest being, the ruler of the world, but
only in name, not in fact. What, however, is
a name? It is a mark of difference, a
striking characteristic, which I make the
character, the representative, of the object
in order thereby to represent it to myself in
its totality...." (195)
- bien dit!

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38,
pp. 386-87

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF FEUERBACH'S BOOK
ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF LEIBNITZ

P. 274 (from the supplement of 1847^b):

"How much has been said of the deception of the senses, how little of the deception of speech, from which, however, thought is inseparable! Yet how clumsy is the betrayal of the senses, how subtle that of language! How long have I been led by the nose by the universality of reason, the universality of Fichte's and Hegel's Ego, until finally, with the support of my five senses, I recognised! for the salvation of my soul that all the difficulties and mysteries of the logos, in the sense of reason, find their solution in the meaning of the word! For that reason *Holzm's* statement 'the critique of reason must become the criticism of language' is for me in a theoretical respect a soul-inspired statement.—As regards, however, the contradiction between me as a perceiving, personal being and me as a thinking being, it reduces itself in the sense of this note and the dissertation quoted" (of Feuerbach himself) "to the sharp contradiction: in sensation I am individual, in thinking I am universal. However, in sensation I am not less universal than I am individual in thinking. Concordance in thinking is based only on concordance in sensation." (274)

..."All human communion rests on the assumption of the likeness of sensation in human beings." (274)

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF HEGEL'S
SCIENCE OF LOGIC

the history
of thought—
the history
of language??

The connection between thought and language (the Chinese language, incidentally, and its lack of development: 11), the formation of nouns and verbs. (11) In the German language words sometimes have “entgegengesetzte Bedeutung” * (12) (not simply “different” but *opposed* meanings)—“a joy to thought....”

The concept of *force* in Physics—and of *polarity* (“the things distinguished *inseparably* (Hegel’s italics) bound up together”). (12) The transition from force to polarity—a transition to “higher Denkverhältnisse.” ** (12)

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol 38, p. 89

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF HEGEL'S
SCIENCE OF LOGIC

Logic is the science not of external forms of thought, but of the laws of development “of all material, natural and spiritual things,” i. e., of the development of the entire concrete content of the world and of its cognition, i. e., the sum-total, the conclusion of the *History* of knowledge of the world.

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol 38, pp
92-93

* “opposed meanings”—*Ed*

** “relations of thought”—*Ed*

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF HEGEL'S
SCIENCE OF LOGIC

How is this to be understood?

Man is confronted with a *web* of natural phenomena. Instinctive man, the savage, does not distinguish himself from nature. Conscious man does distinguish, categories are stages of distinguishing, i. e., of cognising the world, focal points in the web, which assist in cognising and mastering it.

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol 38, p. 93

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF HEGEL'S
SCIENCE OF LOGIC

In the old logic there is no transition, development (of concept and thought), there is not "*eines inneren, notwendigen Zusammenhangs*"* (43) of all the parts and "*Übergang*"** of some parts into others.

NB

And Hegel puts forward two basic requirements:

- 1) "The necessity of connection"
and
- 2) "the immanent emergence of distinctions".

* "*an inner, necessary connection*."—Ed.

** "transition"—Ed.

Very important!! This is what it means, in my opinion:

1. *Necessary* connection, the objective connection of all the aspects, forces, tendencies, etc., of the given sphere of phenomena;

2) The "immanent *emergence* of distinctions"—the inner objective logic of evolution and of the struggle of the differences, polarity.

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38, p 97

FROM THE CONSPPECTUS OF HEGEL'S
SCIENCE OF LOGIC.

The dialectical=

= "comprehending the antithesis in its unity...."

subtle and
profound!

45 Logic resembles grammar, being one thing for the beginner and another thing for one who knows the language (and languages) and the spirit of language. "It is one thing to him who approaches Logic and the Sciences in general for the first time and another thing for him who comes back from the sciences to Logic."...

a good
comparison
(materialist)

"—Just as one and the same moral maxim in the mouth of a youth who understands it quite accurately does not have the significance and scope which it has in the mind of a man of years and experience, for whom it expresses the full force of its content.

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38, pp. 98, 99

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF HEGEL'S
SCIENCE OF LOGIC.
THE DOCTRINE OF BEING

Dialectics is the teaching which shows how *Opposites* can be and how they happen to be (how they become) *identical*,—under what conditions they are identical, becoming transformed into one another,—why the human mind should grasp these opposites not as dead, rigid, but as living, conditional, mobile, becoming transformed into one another. En lisant Hegel*....

134: "*Limit* (is) simple negation or first negation" (des Etwas.** Every Something has its *Limit*) "while Other is at the same time negation of negation...."

137: "Etwas mit seiner immanenten Grenze gesetzt: als der Widerspruch seiner selbst, durch den es über sich hinausgewiesen und getrieben wird, ist das **Endliche**."

(**Something**, taken from the point of view of its immanent Limit—from the point of view of its self-contradiction, a contradiction which drives it [this Something] and leads it beyond its limits, is the *Finite*.)

When things are described as finite,—that is to admit that their not-Being is their nature ("not-Being constitutes their Being").

"They" (things) "*are*, but the truth of this being is their *end*"

* in reading Hegel—*Ed.*

** Something—*Ed.*

NB

thoughts on
dialectics
en lisant
Hegel

Shrewd and clever! Hegel analyses concepts that usually appear to be dead and shows that there is movement in them. Finite? That means *moving* to an end! Something?—means *not that* which is Other. Being in general?—means such indeterminateness that Being = not-Being. All-sided, universal flexibility of concepts, a flexibility reaching to the identity of opposites,—that is the essence of the matter. This flexibility, applied subjectively = eclecticism and sophistry. Flexibility, applied *objectively*, i. e., reflecting the all-sidedness of the material process and its unity, is dialectics, is the correct reflection of the eternal development of the world.

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol 38, pp 109-10

FROM THE CONSPICUOUS OF HEGEL'S
SCIENCE OF LOGIC.
ESSENCE

NB

(1) Ordinary imagination grasps difference and contradiction, but not the **transition** from the one to the other, *this however is the most important*.

(2) Intelligence and understanding.

Intelligence grasps contradiction, *enunciates* it, brings things into relation with one another, allows the "concept to show through the contradiction", but does not *express* the concept of things and their relations.

(3) Thinking reason (understanding) sharpens the blunt difference of variety, the mere manifold of imagination, into *essential* difference, into *opposition*. Only when raised to the peak of contradiction, do the manifold entities become active (regsam) and lively in relation to one another,—they receive* acquire that negativity which is the *inherent pulsation of self-movement and vitality*.

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38, p. 143

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF HEGEL'S
SCIENCE OF LOGIC
ESSENCE.

...“The question cannot therefore be asked, how Form is added to Essence; for Form is only the showing of Essence in itself—it is its own immanent (sic!) Reflection....” (81)

Form is essential. Essence is formed. In one way or another also in dependence on Essence....

Essence as formless identity (of itself with itself) becomes *matter*. (82)

“...It” (die Materie**) “is the real foundation or substratum of Form....” (82)

“If abstraction is made from every determination and Form of a Something, indeterminate Matter remains. Matter is a pure *abstract*. (—Matter cannot be seen or felt, etc.—what is seen or felt is a *determinate Matter*, that is, a unity of Matter and Form).” (82)

* The word “receive” is crossed out in the MS.—Ed.

** matter—Ed.

Matter is not the *Ground* of Form, but the unity of Ground and Grounded. (83) Matter is the *passive*, Form is the *active* (tätiges). (83) "Matter must be formed, and Form must materialise itself...." (84)

NB

||| "Now this, which appears as the activity of Form, is equally the proper movement of Matter itself...." (85-86)

||| ..."Both—the activity of Form and the movement of Matter—are the same.... Matter is determined as such or necessarily has a Form; and Form is simply material, persistent Form." (86)

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38, pp. 144-45

FROM THE CONSPICUOUS OF HEGEL'S SCIENCE OF LOGIC. ESSENCE

... "Many different Things are in essential Reciprocal Action by virtue of their Properties; Property is this very reciprocal relation, and apart from it the Thing is nothing...." (133)

Die Dingheit* passes over into Eigenschaft.** (134) Eigenschaft into "matter" or "Stoff" *** ("things consist of substance"), etc.

"Appearance at this point is Essence in its Existence...." (144) "Appearance ... is the unity of semblance and Existence...." (145)

law (of
appearances)

||| Unity in appearances: "This unity is the Law of Appearance. Law therefore is the positive element in the mediation of the Apparent". (148)

* thinghood—*Ed.*

** property—*Ed.*

*** "substance"—*Ed.*

[Here in general utter obscurity. But there is a vital thought, evidently: the concept of *law* is **one** of the stages of the cognition by man of *unity* and *connection*, of the reciprocal dependence and totality of the world process. The "treatment" and "twisting" of words and concepts to which Hegel devotes himself here is a struggle against making the concept of *law* absolute, against simplifying it, against making a fetish of it. NB for modern physics!!!]

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38,
pp. 150-51

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF HEGEL'S
SCIENCE OF LOGIC.
THE DOCTRINE OF THE NOTION

Essentially, Hegel is completely right as opposed to Kant. Thought proceeding from the concrete to the abstract—provided it is *correct* (NB) (and Kant, like all philosophers, speaks of correct thought)—does not get away *from* the truth but comes closer to it. The abstraction of *matter*, of a *law* of nature, the abstraction of *value*, etc., in short *all* scientific (correct, serious, not absurd) abstractions reflect nature more deeply, truly and *completely*. From living perception to abstract thought, *and from this to practice*,—such is the dialectical path of the cognition of *truth*, of the cognition of objective reality. Kant disparages knowledge in order to make way for faith: Hegel exalts knowledge, asserting that knowledge is knowledge of God. The materialist exalts the knowledge of matter, of nature, consigning God, and the

philosophical rabble that defends God, to
the rubbish heap.

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38, p. 171

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF HEGEL'S
SCIENCE OF LOGIC.
THE DOCTRINE OF THE NOTION

NB:
Hegel *only*
deifies this
"logical idea",
obedience
to law,
universality

"Nature, this immediate totality, unfolds itself in the Logical Idea and Mind." Logic is the science of cognition. It is the theory of knowledge. Knowledge is the reflection of nature by man. But this is not a simple, not an immediate, not a complete reflection, but the process of a series of abstractions, the formation and development of concepts, laws, etc., and these concepts, laws, etc. (thought, science = "the logical Idea") *embrace* conditionally, approximately, the universal law-governed character of eternally moving and developing nature. Here there are *actually*, objectively, **three** members: 1) nature; 2) human cognition=the human **brain** (as the highest product of this same nature), and 3) the form of reflection of nature in human cognition, and this form consists precisely of concepts, laws, categories, etc. Man cannot comprehend=reflect=mirror nature *as a whole*, in its completeness, its "immediate totality", he can only *eternally* come closer to this, creating abstractions, concepts, laws, a scientific picture of the world, etc., etc.

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38, p. 182

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF HEGEL'S BOOK
LECTURES ON THE HISTORY
OF PHILOSOPHY

To be added further on Gorgias:

In the exposition of his view that the
existent cannot be imparted, communicated:

"Speech, by which the existent has to be
expressed, is not the existent, what is
imparted is thus not the existent, but only
words." (Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathe-* || NB
maticos. VII. § 83-84)—*p. 41*—Hegel writes: ||
"The existent is also comprehended as non- || cf.
existent, but the comprehension of it is to || Feuerbach
make it universal." (42)

...**"This** individual cannot be ex-
pressed...." (42)

<p>Every word (speech) already <i>universalises</i> cf. Feuerbach.</p>
--

<p>The senses show reality; thought and word—the universal.</p>

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38, p. 274

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF HEGEL'S BOOK
LECTURES ON THE HISTORY
OF PHILOSOPHY

The Socratics⁷

In connection with the sophisms about the
"heap" and "bald", Hegel repeats the tran-
sition of quantity into quality and vice versa:
dialectics. (Pp. 139-140.)

143-144: At length about the fact that ||||| NB
"language in essence expresses only ||||| in language
the universal; what is meant, however, ||||| there is
is the special, the particular. Hence ||||| only the
what is meant cannot be said in ||||| *universal*
speech." |||||
("It"? The most universal word of all.) |||||

Who is *it*? I. Every person is an I. *Das Sinnliche*?* It is a *universal*, etc., etc. "This"?? Everyone is "this."

Why can the particular not be named? One of the objects of a given kind (tables) is distinguished by something from the rest.

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol 38,
pp 276 77

FROM THE CONSPECIUS OF HEGEL'S BOOK
LECTURES ON THE HISTORY
OF PHILOSOPHY

The concept is not something immediate (although the concept is a "simple" thing, but this simplicity is "spiritual", the simplicity of the Idea)—what is immediate is only the sensation of "red" ("this is red"), etc. The concept is not "merely the thing of consciousness"; but is the *essence of the object* (*gegenständliches Wesen*), it is something *An sich*, "in itself".

... "This conviction of the nature of the Notion, Plato did not express so definitely...." (245)

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol 38, p 281

* the sensuous—Ed

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF HEGEL'S BOOK
LECTURES ON THE HISTORY
OF PHILOSOPHY

The Philosophy of Epicurus

NB: p. 481—on the significance of *words* according to Epicurus:

“Everything has its evidence, energy, distinctness, in the name first conferred on it” ||
(Epicurus: **Diogenes Laertius**, X, § 33). And Hegel: “The name is something universal, belongs to thinking, makes the manifold simple.” (481)

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38, p. 292

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF HEGEL'S BOOK
LECTURES ON THE HISTORY
OF PHILOSOPHY

50. The constitution of a state together with its religion ... philosophy, thought, culture, “external forces” (climate neighbours...) comprise “one substance, one Spirit....”
51. In nature movement takes place only in a cycle (!!)—in history, something new arises....
62. Language is richer among peoples in an undeveloped, primitive state—language becomes poorer with the advance of civilisation and the development of grammar. ||

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38, p. 309

FROM THE CONSPECTUS OF LASSALLE'S BOOK
THE PHILOSOPHY OF HERACLITUS

In the § on “Cratylus”, Lassalle proves that in this dialogue of Plato's Cratylus is

represented (not yet as a sophist and subjectivist as he subsequently became, but) as a true disciple of Heraclitus, who really expounded his, Heraclitus', theory of the essence and origin of words and language as an *imitation* of nature ("imitation of the essence of things", p. 388), the essence of things, "the imitation and copy of God", "imitation of God and the universe" (ibidem).

The history of philosophy. <i>ERGO</i> :		
		kurz, the history of cognition in general
		the whole field of knowledge
Greek Philosophy indicated all these moments	The history of the separate sciences	these are the fields of knowledge from which the theory of knowledge and dialectics should be built
	" " the mental development of the child " " the mental development of animals	
"language NB: + psychology + physiology of the sense organs		

...“We have shown—says Lassalle—that the” (above-mentioned) “conceptual identity (precisely identity, and not merely analogy) between *word*, *name* and *law* is in every respect a principled view of the Heraclitean philosophy and of fundamental importance and significance in it...” (393)

NB ||| ...“Names are for him” (Heraclitus) “laws of being, they are for him the common element of things, just as for him laws are the ‘*common element of all*’”.... (394)

And it is precisely Heraclitean ideas that || very
Hippocrates *expresses* when he says: || important!
"Names are the laws of nature." || NB

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38, pp.
352-53

FROM ON THE QUESTION OF DIALECTICS

In his *Capital*, Marx first analyses the simplest, most ordinary and fundamental, most common and everyday *relation* of bourgeois (commodity) society, a relation encountered billions of times, viz. the exchange of commodities. In this very simple phenomenon (in this "cell" of bourgeois society) analysis reveals *all* the contradictions (or the germs of *all* the contradictions) of modern society. The subsequent exposition shows us the development (*both growth and movement*) of these contradictions and of this society in the Σ^* of its individual parts, from its beginning to its end.

Such must also be the method of exposition (or study) of dialectics in general (for with Marx the dialectics of bourgeois society is only a particular case of dialectics). To begin with what is the simplest, most ordinary, common, etc., with **any proposition**: the leaves of a tree are green; John is a man; Fido is a dog, etc. Here already we have *dialectics* (as Hegel's genius recognised): the **individual** is the *universal* (cf. Aristoteles, *Metaphysik*, translation by Schwegler, Bd. II, S. 40. 3. Buch, 4. Kapitel, 8-9: "denn naturlich kann man nicht der Meinung sein, daß es ein Haus (a house in general) gebe außer den sichtbaren Häusern," "οὐ γὰρ ἂν δείημεν εἶναι τινα οἰκίαν παρὰ τὰς τινας οἰκίας").** (Consequently, the opposites (the individual is opposed to the universal) are identical: the individual exists only in the connection that leads to the universal. The universal exists only in the individual and through the individual. Every individual is (in one way or another) a universal. Every universal is (a fragment, or an aspect, or the essence of) an individual.

* summation—Ed.

** "for, of course, one cannot hold the opinion that there can be a house (in general) apart from visible houses."—Ed

Every universal only approximately embraces all the individual objects. Every individual enters incompletely into the universal, etc., etc. Every individual is connected by thousands of transitions with other **kinds** of individuals (things, phenomena, processes), etc. *Here already* we have the elements, the germs, of the concepts of *necessity*, of objective connection in nature, etc. Here already we have the contingent and the necessary, the phenomenon and the essence; for when we say: John is a man, Fido is a dog, *this* is a leaf of a tree, etc., we *disregard* a number of attributes as *contingent*; we separate the essence from the appearance, and counterpose the one to the other.

Thus in *any* proposition we can (and must) disclose as in a "nucleus" ("cell") the germs of *all* the elements of dialectics, and thereby show that dialectics is a property of all human knowledge in general. And natural science shows us (and here again it must be demonstrated in *any* simple instance) objective nature with the same qualities, the transformation of the individual into the universal, of the contingent into the necessary, transitions, modulations, and the reciprocal connection of opposites. Dialectics *is* the theory of knowledge of (Hegel and) Marxism. This is the "aspect" of the matter (it is not "an aspect" but the *essence* of the matter) to which Plekhanov, not to speak of other Marxists, paid no attention.

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38,
pp. 360-62

FROM THE CONSPICUOUS
OF ARISTOTLE'S BOOK *ME TAPHYSICS*

The approach of the (human) mind to a particular thing, the taking of a copy (=a concept) of it *is not* a simple, immediate act, a dead mirroring, but one which is complex, split into two, zig-zag-like, which *includes in it* the possibility of the flight of fantasy from life; more than that: the possibility of the *transformation* (moreover, an unnoticeable transformation, of which man is unaware) of the abstract concept, idea, into a *fantasy* (in letzter Instanz *=God). For even in the simplest generalisation, in the most elementary

* in the final analysis—Ed.

general idea ("table" in general), *there is* a certain bit of **fantasy**. (Vice versa: it would be stupid to deny the role of fantasy, even in the strictest science: cf. Pisarev on useful dreaming, as an impulse *to* work, and on empty day-dreaming.)

Philosophical Notebooks, Vol. 38,
pp. 372-73

The whole spirit of Marxism, its whole system, demands that each proposition should be considered (α) only historically, (β) only in connection with others, (γ) only in connection with the concrete experience of history.

Lo Inessa Armand, November 30, 1916,
Vol. 35, p. 250

To approach this question⁸ as scientifically as possible we must cast at least a fleeting glance back on the history of the state—its emergence and development. The most reliable thing in a question of social science, and one that is most necessary in order really to acquire the habit of approaching this question correctly and not allowing oneself to get lost in the mass of detail or in the immense variety of conflicting opinion—the most important thing if one is to approach this question scientifically is not to forget the underlying historical connection, to examine every question from the standpoint of how the given phenomenon arose in history and what were the principal stages in its development, and, from the standpoint of its development, to examine what it has become today.

The State, Vol. 29, p. 173

A tumbler is assuredly both a glass cylinder and a drinking vessel. But there are more than these two properties, qualities or facets to it; there are an infinite number of them, an infinite number of "mediacities" and inter-relationships with the rest of the world. A tumbler is a heavy object which can be used as a missile; it can serve as a paperweight, a receptacle for a captive butterfly, or a valuable object with an artistic engraving or design, and this has nothing at all to do with whether or not it can be used for drinking, 's made of glass, is cylindrical or not quite—and so on and so forth.

Moreover, if I needed a tumbler just now for drinking, it

would not in the least matter how cylindrical it was, and whether it was actually made of glass; what would matter though would be whether it had any holes in the bottom, or anything that would cut my lips when I drank, etc. But if I did not need a tumbler for drinking but for a purpose that could be served by any glass cylinder, a tumbler with a cracked bottom or without one at all would do just as well, etc.

Formal logic, which is as far as schools go (and should go, with suitable abridgements for the lower forms), deals with formal definitions, draws on what is most common, or glaring, and stops there. When two or more different definitions are taken and combined at random (a glass cylinder and a drinking vessel), the result is an eclectic definition which is indicative of different facets of the object, and nothing more.

Dialectical logic demands that we should go further. Firstly, if we are to have a true knowledge of an object we must look at and examine all its facets, its connections and "mediacies". That is something we cannot ever hope to achieve completely, but the rule of comprehensiveness is a safeguard against mistakes and rigidity. Secondly, dialectical logic requires that an object should be taken in development, in change, in "self-movement" (as Hegel sometimes puts it). This is not immediately obvious in respect of such an object as a tumbler, but it, too, is in flux, and this holds especially true for its purpose, use and *connection* with the surrounding world. Thirdly, a full "definition" of an object must include the whole of human experience, both as a criterion of truth and a practical indicator of its connection with human wants. Fourthly, dialectical logic holds that "truth is always concrete, never abstract", as the late Plekhanov liked to say after Hegel.

*Once Again on the Trade Unions, the
Current Situation and the Mistakes
of Irotsky and Bukharin, Vol. 32,
pp 92-94*

III. LANGUAGE AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

"In *Capital* Marx gave us an example of the combination of logical force with erudition," says Mr. Mikhailovsky. In this phrase Mr. Mikhailovsky has given us an example of a brilliant phrase combined with lack of substance—a certain Marxist observed. And the observation is a very just one.

*What the "Friends of the People" Are
and How They Fight the Social-Demo-
crats*, Vol. I, p. 135

Even more characteristic and edifying (as an illustration to the saying that man was given a tongue to conceal his thoughts—or to lend vacuity the form of thought) are his comments on Marx's *Capital*⁹: "There are brilliant pages of history in *Capital*, **but**" (that wonderful "but"! It is not so much a "but", as that famous "mais", which translated into Russian means "the ears never grow higher than the forehead"¹⁰) "by virtue of the very purpose of the book they are devoted to only one definite historical period, and not so much affirm the basic propositions of economic materialism as simply touch on the economic aspect of a certain group of historical phenomena."... Of course, there is only one way to achieve this aim—i.e., to embrace all periods without practically dealing with any one of them, and that is by uttering commonplaces and phrases, "brilliant" and empty. And nobody can compare with Mr. Mikhailovsky in the art of dismissing matters with phrases. It seems that it is not worth dealing (separately) with Marx's investigations because he, Marx, "not so much affirms the basic propositions of economic materialism as simply touches on the economic aspect of a certain group of historical phenomena."¹¹ What profundity! "Does not affirm", but "simply touches on"! How simple it really is to obscure any issue by phrasemongering! For instance, when Marx repeatedly shows how

civil equality, free contract and similar principles of the law-governed state are based on relations among commodity producers—what is that? Does he thereby affirm materialism, or “simply” touch on it? With his characteristic modesty, our philosopher refrains from replying on the substance of the matter and directly draws conclusions from his “witty attempts” to talk brilliantly and say nothing.

*What the “Friends of the People” Are
and How They Fight the Social-Demo-
crats, Vol. 1, pp. 149-50*

...History has never known a single important “reform,” even though it has been of a class character, which has not had lofty words and lofty ideas advanced in its support.

*The Economic Content of Narodism and
the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve’s Book,
Vol. 1, p. 451*

The ministers tell the public that it was only “ill-intentioned persons” who tried to give the strikes a “criminally political character”, or as they say in one passage, a “social character”¹² (the ministers wanted to say a socialist character, but, whether from ignorance or from bureaucratic cowardice, said social, the result being an absurdity: socialist means that which supports the workers in the struggle against capital, whereas social simply means public.

*To the Tsarist Government, Vol. 2,
p. 125*

...In a society based on private property and the enslavement of millions of propertyless toilers by a handful of rich people, the government cannot be anything but the loyal friend and ally of the exploiters and the most reliable guardian of their power. In our times, guns, bayonets, and whips are not a sufficiently reliable guardian; it is necessary to convince the exploited that the government stands above classes, that it does not serve the interests of the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie, but those of justice, that it is concerned with protecting the weak and the poor against the rich and the powerful, etc. Napoleon III in France and Bismarck and Wilhelm II in Germany exerted no little effort to play up to the workers in this way.... Over and over again it [this policy] was tried, but each time, within a few years after the

enactment of some "protective" (allegedly protective) labour law, there was a reversion to the old state of affairs—the number of discontented workers increased, ferment grew, unrest gained in scope—again the "protective" policy was announced with a blare of trumpets, again pompous phrases could be heard about heartfelt solicitude for the workers, another law was passed providing a penny's worth of benefit and a pound's worth of empty and lying words for the workers, and in a few years' time the whole business was repeated

A Valuable Admission Vol. 5
pp. 51-82

*Svoboda*¹ is a worthless little rag. Its author—indeed, this is precisely the impression it creates, that one person has written it all, from beginning to end—claims to write popularly "for the workers." But what we have here is not popularisation, but talking down in the worst sense of the term. There is not one simple word, everything is twisted.

The author cannot write a single phrase without embellishments, without "popular" similes and "popular" catchwords such as "therein." Outworn socialist ideas are chewed over in this ugly language without any new data, any new examples, any new analysis, and the whole thing is deliberately vulgarised. Popularisation, we should like to inform the author, is a long way from vulgarisation, from talking down.

The popular writer leads his reader towards profound thoughts, towards profound study, proceeding from simple and generally known facts, with the aid of simple arguments or striking examples he shows the main *conclusions* to be drawn from those facts and arouses in the mind of the thinking reader ever newer questions. The popular writer does not presuppose a reader that does not think, that cannot or does not wish to think, on the contrary, he assumes in the undeveloped reader a serious intention to use his head and *aids* him in his serious and difficult work, leads him, helps him over his first steps, and *teaches* him to go forward independently.

The Journal Svoboda Vol. 5 p. 311

"Freedom" is a grand word, but under the banner of freedom for industry the most predatory wars were waged,

under the banner of freedom of labour, the working people were robbed. The modern use of the term "freedom of criticism"¹⁴ contains the same inherent falsehood. Those who are really convinced that they have made progress in science would not demand freedom for the new views to continue side by side with the old, but the substitution of the new views for the old. The cry heard today, "Long live freedom of criticism", is too strongly reminiscent of the fable of the empty barrel.

What Is to Be Done Burning Questions of Our Movement Vol. 5
p. 355

In a country ruled by an autocracy, with a completely enslaved press, in a period of desperate political reaction in which even the tiniest outgrowth of political discontent and protest is persecuted, the theory of revolutionary Marxism suddenly forces its way into the *censored* literature and, though expounded in Aesopian language, is understood by all the "interested".

What Is to Be Done Burning Questions of Our Movement Vol. 5
p. 361

Since there can be no talk of an independent ideology formulated by the working masses themselves in the process of their movement, the *only* choice is—either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course (for mankind has not created a "third" ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or an above-class ideology).

What Is to Be Done Burning Questions of Our Movement Vol. 5
p. 384

The propagandist operates chiefly by means of the *printed* word, the agitator by means of the *spoken* word.

What Is to Be Done Burning Questions of Our Movement Vol. 5
p. 410

In a word, every trade-union secretary conducts and helps to conduct "the economic struggle against the employers and the government". It cannot be too strongly

maintained that *this is still not* Social-Democracy, that the Social-Democrat's ideal should not be the trade-union secretary, but *the tribune of the people*, who is able to react to every manifestation of tyranny and oppression, no matter where it appears, no matter what stratum or class of the people it affects; who is able to generalise all these manifestations and produce a single picture of police violence and capitalist exploitation; who is able to take advantage of every event, however small, in order to set forth *before all* his socialist convictions and his democratic demands, in order to clarify for *all* and everyone the world-historic significance of the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat.

What Is to Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement, Vol. 5, p. 423

...“The higher administrative authorities,” continues the memorandum,¹⁵ setting forth the complaints of the manufacturers, “go still further [than the law] and flatly regard *all* [italics as in the original] cases of strikes as matters of state importance.... Actually, however, every strike (of course if not accompanied by violence) is a purely economic phenomenon, which is quite natural and in no way jeopardises public law and order. In these cases law and order should be maintained in the same way as during popular festivities, celebrations, performances, and like occasions.”

This is the language of genuine Manchester¹⁶ Liberals, who proclaim that the struggle between capital and labour is a purely natural phenomenon, who with remarkable frankness put on a par “trade in commodities” and “trade in labour” (elsewhere in the memorandum), demand non-interference by the state, and assign to this state the role of night (and day) watchman....

The Draft of a New Law on Strikes, Vol. 6, pp. 218-19

The autocracy is wavering. The autocrat himself publicly admits this to the people. That is the enormous significance of the tsar's Manifesto of February 26,¹⁷ and no amount of conventional phrases, none of the reservations or subterfuges the Manifesto abounds in, can alter the historic importance of the step that has been taken....

The tsar reaffirms his sacred vow to safeguard the age-old

pillars of the Russian Empire. Translated into Russian from the language of officialdom, this means: to safeguard the autocracy....

The Autocracy is Wavering..., Vol. 6, p. 346

...Ideas expressing the needs, interests, strivings, and aspirations of a certain class are in the very air, and their identity cannot be concealed by any differences of garb, by any variations of opportunist or "Socialist-Revolutionary" phraseology. Murder will out.

Le Beaux Esprits Se Recontrent (Which May Be Interpreted Roughly: Birds of a Feather Flock Together), Vol. 6, p. 132

However, excursions into the realm of science are no more than an architectural ornament to Mr. L.'s article. True practical politician that he is, he offers us, along with sheer muddle-headedness in general reasoning, an extremely sober and business-like practical programme. True, he makes the modest reservation—in his stilted official Russian—that he disclaims all intention of adumbrating a programme and confines himself to intimating his attitude—but that is just his modesty. Actually, we have in Mr. L.'s article a very complete and detailed agrarian programme for the Russian liberals, which only lacks stylistic editing and paragraphing by clauses.

The Narodnik-Like Bourgeoisie and Distracted Narodism, Vol. 7, pp. 106-07

...We must make it the constant job of publicists to write the history of the present day, and to try to write it in such a way that our chronicles will give the greatest possible help to the direct participants in the movement and to the heroic proletarians there, on the scene of action¹⁸—to write it in such a way as to promote the spread of the movement, the conscious selection of the means, ways, and methods of struggle that, with the least expenditure of effort, will yield the most substantial and permanent results.

Revolutionary Days, Vol. 8, p. 104

...Besides, our wise Martynov has a Tryapichkin¹⁹ on a string in the shape of Martov, who is capable of rendering his teacher more profound and who can well substitute the slogan "*Unleash the Revolution!*" for the slogan "*Organise the Revolution!*"

Yes, dear reader, this is the slogan we are given in *Iskra's*²⁰ leading article. These days, apparently, it is enough to "unleash" one's tongue for a free chatter-process, or for the process of chatter, in order to be able to write leading articles. The opportunist invariably requires slogans that, on closer scrutiny, are found to be nothing but high-sounding phrases, nothing but decadent word-jugglery.

Should We Organise the Revolution?
Vol. 8, p. 169

...Who are these "lower strata" of society, the "people" of whom our sage has at last bethought himself? They are precisely that multitudinous petty-bourgeois stratum of town and village which is quite capable of functioning in a revolutionary-democratic capacity. And what is this *pressure* that the proletariat and the peasantry can exert on the upper social strata, what is meant by the proletariat advancing together with the people in despite of the upper social strata? It is *that same revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry* against which our tail-enders is declaiming! Only he is afraid to think to the end, to call a spade a spade. And so he utters words whose meaning he does not understand. In ludicrous, florid language, he timidly repeats slogans, the true significance of which escapes him.

Social-Democracy and the Provisional Revolutionary Government, Vol. 8,
pp. 284-85

With the bourgeoisie occupying a position between the hammer and the anvil, idealistic phrases, too, are psychologically inevitable, phrases which our liberals in general and their pet philosophers in particular are now mouthing with such bad taste. "As far as the Russian liberation movement is concerned," we read in the explanatory comment, "democracy is not only a fact but a moral and political postulate. It places moral justification for any social form above its historical justification...." Not a bad example of the turgid

meaningless phraseology with which our liberals "justify" their approach towards betrayal of democracy!

Political Sophisms, Vol. 8, p. 429

The party, as we have said, has no official designation. Mr. P. S. calls it by the name under which, I believe, it goes in the columns of our legal newspapers of the liberal trend, namely, "Constitutional-Democratic Party".²¹ Unimportant though the question of name may appear at first glance, here too we immediately find material that explains why the bourgeoisie, unlike the proletariat, *must* content itself with political vagueness and even defend it "in principle"; it "must" do this, not only on account of the subjective moods or qualities of its leaders, but by reason of the objective conditions governing the existence of the bourgeois class as a whole. The name "Constitutional-Democratic Party" immediately calls to mind the well-known adage that speech was given to man in order that he might conceal his thoughts. The name "C.D.P." was invented to conceal the *monarchist* nature of the party.

Revolutionary Struggle and Liberal Brokerage, Vol. 8, p. 488

Here is the resolution on a provisional government adopted by the Caucasian Conference of new-*Iskra* supporters²²:

"Whereas we consider it to be our task to take advantage of the revolutionary situation so as to deepen [of course! They should have added: "*à la* Martynov!"] Social-Democratic consciousness in the proletariat [only to render the consciousness more profound, and not to win a republic? What a "profound" conception of revolution!] and in order to secure for the Party complete freedom to criticise the nascent bourgeois-state system [it is not our business to secure a republic! Our business is only to secure freedom of criticism. Anarchist ideas engender anarchist language: "bourgeois-state" system!], the Conference declares itself against the formation of a Social-Democratic provisional government, and entering such a government [recall the resolution passed by the Bakuninists²³ ten months before the Spanish revolution and referred to by Engels: see *Proletary*, No. 3], and considers it to be the most expedient course to

exercise pressure from without [from below and not from above] upon the bourgeois provisional government in order to secure a feasible measure [!?] of democratisation of the state system. The Conference believes that the formation of a provisional government by Social-Democrats, or their entering such a government would lead, on the one hand, to the masses of the proletariat becoming disappointed in the Social-Democratic Party and abandoning it, because the Social-Democrats, despite the seizure of power, would not be able to satisfy the pressing needs of the working class, including the establishment of socialism [a republic is not a pressing need! The authors in their innocence do not notice that they are speaking purely anarchist language, as if they were repudiating participation in bourgeois revolutions!], and, on the other hand, *would cause the bourgeois classes to recoil from the revolution and thus diminish its sweep.*"

Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, Vol. 9, pp. 93-94

That is what the present-day new-Iskrists so often fail to understand, people who substitute for active political slogans in the democratic revolution a mere pedantic repetition of the word "class", declined in all cases and genders!

Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, Vol. 9, p. 112

...A bourgeois philosopher or a bourgeois publicist will never understand Social-Democracy properly, whether it is Menshevik or Bolshevik.²¹ Social-Democracy. But if he is at all a sensible publicist, his class instinct will not fail him, and he will always grasp the essence of what one trend or another in the Social-Democratic movement may mean to the bourgeoisie, although he may present it in a distorted way. That is why our enemy's class instinct, his class opinion always deserves the closest attention from every class-conscious proletarian.

Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, Vol. 9 p. 117

Abuse of terms is a most common practice in politics. The name "socialist", for example, has often been appropriated

by supporters of English bourgeois liberalism ("We are all socialists now," said Harcourt), by supporters of Bismarck, and by friends of Pope Leo XIII. The term "revolution" also fully lends itself to abuse, and, at a certain stage in the development of the movement, such abuse is inevitable. When Mr. Struve began to speak in the name of revolution we could not but recall Thiers. A few days before the February revolution this monstrous gnome, this most perfect embodiment of the bourgeoisie's political venality sensed that a storm was brewing among the people, and announced from the parliamentary tribune that he was *of the party of revolution!* (See Marx's *The Civil War in France*.) The political significance of *Osvobozhdeniye's* joining the party of revolution is *exactly the same as* Thiers's. When the Russian Thiers begin to speak of their belonging to the party of revolution, that means that the slogan of revolution has become inadequate, is meaningless, and defines no tasks since the revolution has become a fact, and the most diverse elements are going over to its side.

Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, Vol. 9, pp. 127-28

True, *Iskra* mentions neither of these slogans in its leaflet.²⁵ It enumerates and describes actions whose sum is characteristic of a provisional revolutionary government, but avoids mentioning the term. That is to be regretted. In actual fact it accepts this slogan, but the absence of a clear term can only create vacillation and uncertainty, and sow confusion in fighters' minds. Fear of the words "revolutionary government" and "revolutionary power" is a purely anarchist fear, and unworthy of a Marxist.

Revolution Teaches, Vol. 9, pp. 154-55

"Insurrection" is an important word. A call to insurrection is an extremely serious call. The more complex the social system, the better the organisation of state power, and the more perfected the military machine, the more impermissible is it to launch such a slogan without due thought. And we have stated repeatedly that the revolutionary Social-Democrats have long been preparing to launch it, but have launched it as a direct call only when there could be no doubt whatever of the gravity, widespread and deep roots of

the revolutionary movement, no doubt of matters having literally come to a head. Important words must be used with circumspection. Enormous difficulties have to be faced in translating them into important deeds. It is precisely for that reason that it would be unpardonable to dismiss these difficulties with a mere phrase, to use Manilovist inventions²⁶ to brush aside serious tasks or to put on one's eyes the blinkers of sweet dreams of so-called "natural transitions" to these difficult tasks.

The Latest in "Iskra" Tactics, or Mock Elections as a New Incentive to an Uprising, Vol. 9, pp. 367-69

...The Cadet professors who are trading in their science for the benefit of the Dubasovs went to the length (like Mr. Kiesewetter, member of the Central Committee of the Cadet Party and candidate for the Duma) of translating the word "dictatorship" by the words "reinforced security"! These "men of science" even distorted their high-school Latin in order to discredit the revolutionary struggle. Please note once and for all, Messrs. Kiesewetter, Struve, Izgoyev and Co., that dictatorship means unlimited power based on force, and not on law. In civil war, any victorious power can only be a dictatorship. The point is, however, that there is the dictatorship of a minority over the majority, the dictatorship of a handful of police officials over the people; and there is the dictatorship of the overwhelming majority of the people over a handful of tyrants, robbers and usurpers of people's power. By their vulgar distortion of the scientific concept "dictatorship", by their outcries against the violence of the Left at a time when the Right are resorting to the most lawless and outrageous violence, the Cadet gentlemen have given striking evidence of the position the "compromisers" take in the intense revolutionary struggle. When the struggle flares up, the "compromiser" cravenly runs for cover. When the revolutionary people are victorious (October 17), the "compromiser" creeps out of his hiding-place, boastfully preens himself, shouting and raving until he is hoarse: "That was a 'glorious' political strike!" But when victory goes to the counter-revolution, the compromiser begins to heap hypocritical admonitions and edifying counsel on the vanquished.

The Victory of the Cadets and the Tasks of the Workers Party, Vol. 10, p. 216

...If the autocracy succeeds in finally and completely crushing the revolution, the Cadets will become powerless, for their strength is derived from the strength of the revolution. If the revolutionary people, i.e., the proletariat, and the peasantry rising in revolt against the whole system of landlordism, crush the autocracy finally and completely, and hence, sweep away the monarchy with all its frills and trimmings, the Cadets will also be powerless, for all the virile elements will desert them either for the revolution or for the counter-revolution; and the party will be left with a couple of Kiesewetters sighing about the "dictatorship", and digging Latin dictionaries for the appropriate Latin terms. Briefly, the Cadets' tactics may be formulated as follows: *to ensure the support of the revolutionary people for the Cadet Party*. By "support" they evidently mean such action by the revolutionary people as will, first, be entirely subordinated to the interests of the Cadet Party and carried out according to its instructions, etc.; and secondly, not be too resolute and aggressive, and above all, not be too drastic. The revolutionary people must not be independent, that is the first point; and it must not achieve final victory, it must not crush its enemy, that is point two. These are the tactics that, on the whole, will inevitably be pursued by the entire Cadet Party and by any Cadet Duma. And, of course, these tactics will be backed, defended and justified with the aid of the rich ideological stock-in-trade of "scientific" investigations,* "philosophical" obscurities, political (or politicians') banalities; "literary-critical" squealing (*à la* Berdayev), etc., etc.

*The Victory of the Cadets and the Tasks
of the Workers' Party*, Vol. 10, p. 230

The peasant says: "The land is God's, the land is the people's, the land is nobody's." The "divisionists"²⁷ tell us that the peasant says this without realising what he is saying; that he says one thing and means another. All that the peasants are really striving for, they tell us, is additional land; they want to enlarge their small farms, and no more. All this is quite true. But our disagreement with the

* Like those of Mr. Kiesewetter, who has discovered that "dictatorship" in Latin means reinforced security.

“divisionists” does not end here, it only begins. We must use what the peasants say, even if it is economically unsound or meaningless, as a hook for our propaganda. We must say to them: You say that everybody ought to have the right to use the land? You want to transfer the land to the people? Excellent! But what does transferring the land to the people mean? Who controls the people’s wealth and the people’s property? The government officials, the Trepovs. Do you want to transfer the land to Trepov and to the government officials? No. Every peasant will say that it is not to them that he wants to transfer the land. Do you want to transfer the land to the Petrunkeviches and Rodichevs, who, perhaps, will sit on the municipal councils? No. The peasant will certainly not want to transfer the land to these gentlemen. Hence—we will explain to the peasants—if the land is to be transferred to the whole people in a way that will benefit the peasants, it is necessary to ensure that all government officials without exception are elected by the people.

*Minutes of the Unity Congress of the
R.S.D.I.P., Vol. 10, p. 287*

Plekhanov comments on this as follows:

“If our Poltava comrade had to apply his general propositions to the Socialist Party in France, he would not have to make any serious changes in the last lines of his article. He could merely substitute the word ‘radical’ for the word ‘Cadet’, ‘Chamber of Deputies’ for ‘Duma’,²⁸ and lastly, the phrase ‘social-historical movement’ for ‘Russian revolution’. That is amazingly convenient.”²⁹

We invite our readers to go over this passage from *Kolokol* and Plekhanov’s comment once again. The latter reveals to us with rare clarity one of the causes of Plekhanov’s turn towards Bernstein.

Just think. “*Kolokol*” could merely substitute, in the last lines of its article, the word “radical” for “Cadet” and the phrase “Chamber of Deputies” for “Duma”.

This argument nails Comrade Plekhanov’s fallacies to the counter.

Comrade Plekhanov’s attempt to draw a parallel between Russia and France shows that he is entirely immersed in constitutional illusions. He takes the name (parliament, chamber) for the object; the label for the contents. That is

why he completely loses sight of all the more important special features of the present situation in Russia, when a struggle is maturing between the "people"—which is least represented in the Duma—and the old authorities, and the role of the "compromisers", of deserters in this struggle, is *becoming* particularly important and particularly *dangerous*.

How Comrade Plekhanov Argues About Social-Democratic Tactics, Vol. 10, pp. 469-70

Just as it was necessary at one time to repeat and reiterate the ABC of Marxism to counter Bernstein, so it is necessary to do so now to counter Plekhanov. He is greatly mistaken. "Treachery" is not "an abusive term"; it is the only scientifically and politically correct term with which to express the actual facts about, and the actual aspirations of, the bourgeoisie. The word "treachery" expresses the same idea as the phrase "striking a bargain". Plekhanov himself cannot help admitting this, for he identifies treachery with reconciliation with the bureaucracy.

How Comrade Plekhanov Argues About Social-Democratic Tactics, Vol. 10, pp. 473

How was the government's communication framed? Like a real fighting manifesto of the reactionary monarchist party. Oh, the reactionaries are not bashful in the least! They know how to write in militant terms. In their "communication" they plainly speak in the name of the *government*.³⁰ Indeed, why should they stand on ceremony? The liberal professors claim that we are living under a constitutional system and that the Duma is also a part of the government. Let the professors chatter! Let them amuse the people with their constitutional antics! We reactionaries are practical men. We know that, *in fact*, we are the government. We say so plainly. As for the quibbles and formalism of these liberal pedants, we don't care a fig for them.

A Bold Assault and a Timid Defence, Vol. 11, p. 97

It would be well if the example of these gentlemen³¹ taught the Russian intelligentsia, which so prolifically produces such jelly-fish, to realise how harmful opportunism is.

Very often this word is wrongly regarded as “merely a term of abuse” and no attempt is made to grasp its meaning. The opportunist does not betray his party, he does not act as a traitor, he does not desert it. He continues to serve it sincerely and zealously. But his typical and characteristic trait is that he yields to the mood of the moment, he is unable to resist what is fashionable, he is politically short-sighted and spineless. Opportunism means sacrificing the permanent and essential interests of the party to momentary, transient and minor interests. A slight revival of industry, a relative improvement in trade and a slight revival of bourgeois liberalism, and the opportunist begins to shout: Don’t frighten the bourgeoisie away, don’t fight shy of it, drop your “phrase-mongering” about social revolution! The Duma has assembled, a police-constitutional “spring” is in the air—and lo! the opportunist is already calling the Duma a power, hastening to curse the “fatal” boycott and hurrying forward with the slogan: support the demand for a Duma, i.e., a Cadet, Cabinet. As soon as the tide turns, the opportunist, just as sincerely, and just as inopportunistly, begins to “scold” the Cadets and demolish constitutional illusions.

The Russian Radical is Wise After the Event, Vol. 11, p. 239

Let us point out, too, that in the election campaign in general, and in concluding electoral agreements at the higher stages, the Social-Democrats must speak simply and clearly, in a language comprehensible to the masses, absolutely discarding the heavy artillery of erudite terms, foreign words and stock slogans, definitions and conclusions which are as yet unfamiliar and unintelligible to the masses. Without flamboyant phrases, without rhetoric, but with facts and figures, they must be able to *explain* the questions of socialism and of the present Russian revolution.

The Social Democrats and Electoral Agreements, Vol. 11, p. 294

There is considerable controversy in our Party at the present time as to the meaning of the word “blocs”. Some say that a bloc means a joint list of candidates; others deny this and say that it means a common platform. All these disputes are silly and scholastic. It does not make the

slightest difference whether the narrower or the wider agreements are called blocs. The central issue is not whether wide or narrow agreements are permissible. Whoever thinks so is immersing himself in petty and trivial parliamentary technique and forgetting the *political substance* of that technique. The central issue is: *on what lines* should the socialist proletariat enter into agreements with the bourgeoisie, which, generally speaking, are inevitable in the course of a bourgeois revolution. The Bolsheviks may differ among themselves in regard to details, e.g., whether electoral agreements are necessary with this or that party of the revolutionary bourgeoisie, but that is not the central issue between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. The central issue remains the same: should the socialist proletariat in a bourgeois revolution follow in the wake of the liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie, or should it march in front of the revolutionary-democratic bourgeoisie.

Blocs with the Cadets, Vol. 11, p. 310

...Vasilyev's whole article, all his ideas, all his proposals³² are imbued with the "plan" to facilitate the birth of a constitution by killing the revolution. To "temporarily relinquish" all programmes, to merge all Social-Democrats, Socialist-Revolutionaries,³³ and suchlike with the Cadets in one liberal party, to unite them all for the struggle for a "political constitution" "without the simultaneous solution of economic programmes" (this is exactly what the letter says—"without solution of programmes". The Swiss advisers of the Russian proletariat are not always able to express themselves in good Russian)—does not all this evince a desire to save the constitution by renouncing the revolution?

Plekhanov and Vasilyev, Vol. 11,
pp. 422-23

For this very reason the Social-Democrats include *confiscation* of the landed estates in their programme. It is only the extreme opportunists among Social-Democrats who are not in sympathy with this programme and defend the substitution of the word "alienation" for "confiscation", although *they are afraid to present such a draft openly*.

Cadets and Trudoviks, Vol. 12, p. 191

. Kutler began to raise objection to the Trudoviks¹⁴ in respect of the "practical feasibility" of land nationalisation.

All that is merely malicious tittle-tattle, because if the 70,000,000 dessiatines are left to the landlords there will be *nothing to nationalise!* But Mr Kutler speaks only *to conceal his thoughts*

Five Years — Five Days Vol. 12
p. 304

Try for once *to think over* the words you use to compile your phrases, comrades! Can there be a "politically conscious" proletarian who is *not a Social-Democrat*? If there cannot be, then your words boil down to empty tautology, to turgid and pretentious trivialities. Then you should speak of extending the R S D I P to include real Social-Democrats who have not yet joined its ranks.

If there can be, then you are calling the proletarian Socialist Revolutionary a politically conscious proletarian. It would be ridiculous to deny his "political consciousness"! And so what follows is that, under cover of grandiloquent words about the 'self-organisation' and "independence" of a class party, you are *actually* preaching the *disorganisation* of the proletariat by inducing *non-proletarian* ideologists, by *confusing* real independence (Social-Democracy) with non-independence, with dependence on bourgeois ideology and bourgeois politics (Socialist Revolutionaries).

You were making for one destination, but reached another.

Intellectual Warriors Against Domination by the Intelligence Vol. 12
pp. 317-18

What *mass* organisations can grow on the soil of *group* needs, the Lord alone knows. By group, something small is always meant, something diametrically opposed to the mass. The authors of the resolution string words together without thinking of concrete, definite content.¹⁵

What then does this mean—mass organisations on the soil of *local* needs? What sort of organisation the authors have in mind is again not clear. If they are talking about such organisations as consumers' societies, co-operatives, etc., their distinctive feature is certainly not their *local* character. The Mensheviks' love of platitudinous phrases, their evasion of

the *concrete* exposition of a question, is a purely intellectualist trait. It is at root alien to the proletariat, and harmful from the standpoint of the proletariat.

Angry Embarrassment, Vol. 12,
pp. 320-21

After all that has been said above, there is no need to dwell at length on the second passage quoted. It reads: "The Mensheviks bargained with the Cadets to get their man into the Duma, in spite of the workers, with the aid of the Cadets—such is the simple explanation of all these peregrinations from the Social-Democrats to the petty-bourgeois bloc and from the petty-bourgeois bloc to the Cadets."³⁶ If you analyse this passage formally, and superficially, from the standpoint of a *united* party, you will certainly say—in referring to Party members you should have said "conducting negotiations" and not "bargaining", "to secure the election of" instead of "get", a "Social-Democrat deputy" instead of "their man", and so on. But would such an "analysis" of the quotation, or such an "opinion" of the method of expression, evoke anything but a smile? Is it not clear that the use of the most offensive and contemptuous mode of expression, which puts everything in the worst light, not in the best, is a method of fighting that stems from a split, of fighting *for the extermination* of the organisation which *disrupts* the political campaign of the local Social-Democratic proletariat? To complain about the offensive, insulting, and insidious character of the expressions used would be the same as if a *strike-breaker* were to complain of the bitterness displayed towards him by strikers. To discuss complaints or accusations on this plane would be the same as if we were to condemn the word "strike-breaker" as being impermissible, without going into *the essence* of the question of whether the behaviour of the person concerned was actually that of a strike-breaker or not.

Report to the Fifth Congress of the
R.S.D.L.P. on the St. Petersburg Split
and the Institution of the Party Tribunal
Ensuing Therefrom, Vol. 12,
pp. 429-30

...Therefore, the term "bourgeois-democratic", as you use it, is nothing but a platonic declaration of respect for

Marxism, since your use of the term is not accompanied by the association of such-and-such a type of liberalism or democracy with such-and-such self-interests of definite strata of the bourgeoisie. No wonder our liberals, beginning with the Party of Democratic Reform and the Cadets and ending with the non-party *Bez Zaglaviya* group³⁷ from *Tovarishch*,³⁸ seeing that the Mensheviks apply Marxism in *such a way*, enthusiastically seize on the "idea" of the harmfulness of extremes of opportunism and revolutionism in democracy... because it is not an idea at all, but a banal platitude. It is, of course, not the *term* "bourgeois democracy" that scares the liberal. What scares him is an exposure, before the people, of what material interests of precisely which wealthy classes liberal programmes and phrases boil down to. That, and not the term "bourgeois democracy", is the gist of the matter. Not he who persistently uses the term "bourgeois democracy" to protect himself, as though he were crossing himself, is applying the theory of the class struggle, but he who shows, in practice how the bourgeois character of a party manifests itself.

If the concept "bourgeois democracy" implies only condemnation of the extremes of both opportunism and revolutionism, then it is a concept that degrades Marxist theory to the level of banal liberal phraseology. The liberal, we repeat, does not fear such use of the concept, for it is deeds that he fears, not *words*. He may consent to accept a term that is, to him, unpleasant and "reeking of Marxism". But neither the liberal, nor the "intellectual" from *Tovarishch*, who apes the Bernsteinians, will agree to accept the view that he, the Cadet, expresses the interests of the bourgeois who is selling out the revolution to someone or other.

The Attitude Towards Bourgeois Parties,
Vol. 12, p. 498

If anyone wants to persuade the *Social-Democratic* proletariat that the slogan of boycott is a correct one, he must not allow himself to be carried away by the mere sound of words that in their time played a great and glorious revolutionary role. He must weigh the objective conditions for applying such a slogan and realise that to launch it assumes indirectly the existence of conditions making for a

sweeping, universal, powerful, and rapid revolutionary upswing. But in periods such as we are now living in, in periods of a temporary lull in the revolution, such a condition can in no circumstances be indirectly assumed. It must be directly and distinctly realised and made clear both to oneself and to the whole working class. Otherwise one runs the risk of finding oneself in the position of a person who uses big words without understanding their true meaning or who hesitates to speak plainly and call a spade a spade.

Against Boycott, Vol. 13, p. 36

...“Do not ask, as some here have done: ‘What is justice?’ [The speaker is evidently referring to the Cadet landlord Tatarinov who, at the 24th session, on April 9, said: “Justice, gentlemen, is a rather relative term,” “justice is an ideal towards which we are all striving, but this ideal remains” (for the Cadet) “only an ideal, and whether it will be possible to achieve it is still an open question for me.” 1779.] Man is justice. When a man is born—it is just that he should live, and to live it is just that he should have the opportunity to earn his bread by his labour.”...³⁹

You see: this ideologist of the peasantry adopts the typical standpoint of the French eighteenth-century Enlightener. He does not understand the historical limitedness, the historically-determined content of *his* justice. But for the sake of this abstract justice he *wants to*, and the class he represents is *able to completely sweep away* all the vestiges of medievalism. That is the *real* historical content of the demand that justice must not be sacrificed to “expediency”. It means: no concessions to medievalism, to the landlords, to the old regime. It is the language of the members of the Convention.⁴⁰

The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907. Vol. 13, pp. 395-96

This tirade, so typical of the Trudovik, raises an interesting question: Is there any difference between *such* speeches about the right to work and the speeches about the right to work delivered by the French petty-bourgeois democrats of 1848? Both are certainly declamations of a bourgeois democrat *vaguely* expressing the real historical content of the

struggle. The declamations of the Trudovik, however, *vaguely* express the actual aims of the *bourgeois* revolution which objective conditions make possible (i.e., make possible a peasant agrarian revolution in twentieth-century Russia), whereas the declamations of the French *Kleinburger* in 1848 vaguely expressed the aims of the *socialist* revolution, which was impossible in France in the middle of the last century. In other words, the right to work demanded by the French workers in the middle of the nineteenth century expressed a desire to remodel the *whole* of small production on the lines of co-operation, socialism, and so forth, and that was *economically* impossible. The right to work demanded by the Russian peasants in the twentieth century expresses the desire to remodel small *agricultural* production on *nationalised* land, and that is *economically* quite possible. The twentieth-century Russian peasants' 'right to work' has a real bourgeois content in addition to its unsound socialistic theory. The right to work demanded by the French petty bourgeois and worker in the middle of the nineteenth century contained *nothing* but an unsound socialistic theory. That is the difference that many of our Marxists overlook.

*The Agrarian Programme of Social
Democracy in the First Russian Revolution
1905-1907* Vol. 13 pp. 396-97

Comparing the speeches of the revolutionary peasants in the Second Duma with those of the revolutionary workers, one is struck by the following difference. The former are imbued with a far more spontaneous revolutionary spirit, a passionate desire to destroy the landlord regime immediately, and immediately to create a new system. The peasant is eager to fling himself upon the enemy at once and to strangle him. Among the workers this revolutionary spirit is more abstract, aimed as it were, at a remoter goal. This difference is quite understandable and legitimate. The peasant is making *his* bourgeois revolution now, at this moment, and does not see its inherent contradictions; he is not even aware that there are such contradictions. The Social-Democratic worker does see them and because he sets himself aims of world socialism, *cannot* make the fate of the working-class movement hinge on the outcome of a bourgeois revolution. Only we must not conclude from this that the worker must support the liberals in the bourgeois

revolution. The conclusion to be drawn from it is that, while merging *with no other* class, the worker must *with all his energy* help the peasant to carry through this bourgeois revolution to the end.

The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907, Vol. 13, pp. 399-400

The speeches of the *peasants* in the Duma are of tremendous political importance, because in them were expressed that passionate desire to get rid of the yoke of the landlords, that fiery hatred of medievalism and the bureaucracy, that spontaneous, ingenuous, often naïve and not quite definite, but at the same time stormy revolutionary spirit of the *ordinary* peasants, which prove better than any long arguments what potential destructive energy has accumulated within the mass of the peasantry against the nobility, the landlords and the Romanovs. The task of the class-conscious proletariat is mercilessly to show up, expose and eliminate all the numerous petty-bourgeois deceptions, allegedly socialist phrases, childish naïve expectations which the peasants link with an agrarian revolution—but to eliminate them not in order to calm and pacify the peasants (as the betrayers of the people's freedom, the Cadet gentlemen, did in both Dumas) but in order to awaken among the masses a steel-like, unshakable and resolute revolutionary spirit.

The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the Russian Revolution, Vol. 15, p. 178

...The resolution itself says that “the main object” of the revolution is to “wrest political power from the hands of the reactionary government”. Although shying at the words “seizure of power and dictatorship”, and renouncing these terrible things in the most emphatic manner, the Mensheviks *were forced to admit* after 1905 that the “union” of the Soviets of Workers’ Deputies with “similar” revolutionary-democratic bodies followed logically from the course of events, and that this *union* must result in the formation of “*general* non-party” (this is not quite correct; it should have read: non-party or inter-party) “organisations of popular revolutionary struggle”. But this *general organisation* is nothing else than a provisional revolutionary government! Afraid to use

the exact and direct term, the Mensheviks replaced it by a *description*; but that does not alter matters. "An organ of popular revolutionary struggle" that "wrests political power" from the hands of the old government is nothing more nor less than a provisional revolutionary government.

The Aim of the Proletarian Struggle in Our Revolution, Vol. 15, pp. 364-65

..."Russia ... is moving towards a new revolutionary upswing".... Quite right! She is only *moving towards* an upswing, i.e., there is no upswing yet—that is what this means, both in logic and in grammar! It appears, however, that this still non-existing upswing is "characterised by a sharp conflict", etc. The result is utter nonsense. The otzovists⁴¹ are incapable of characterising the present. They "characterise" the future, which we are "moving towards", in order to cover up failure to understand the present....

A Caricature of Bolshevism, Vol. 15, pp. 383-84

For Bills introduced by the Social-Democratic group in the Duma to fulfil their purpose, the following conditions are necessary.

(1) Bills must set out in the clearest and most definite form the individual demands of the Social-Democrats included in the minimum programme of our Party⁴² or necessarily following from this programme;

(2) Bills must never be burdened with an abundance of legal subtleties; they must give the *main grounds* for the proposed laws, but not elaborately worded texts & laws with all details....

Explanatory Note on the Draft of the Main Grounds of the Bill on the Eight-Hour Working Day, Vol. 16, p. 111

...But we'll see nevertheless what you have to say as a historian?⁴³ Three chief trends: the first is "demagogic monarchism". Its "purpose" is to "defend the old social foundations of life", a "combination of unlimited autocracy [the liberal, the Constitutional-Democrat unconsciously goes over to the standpoint of the Octobrist⁴⁴ who upholds limited autocracy] with the peasantry on the basis of those patriarchal relations in which the nobility is the natural intermediary

between the one and the other”.... Translated from the language of liberalism into plain ordinary Russian this means the domination of the feudal (“patriarchal”) landlords and Black-Hundred* tsarism....

The Last Word of Russian Liberalism,
Vol. 16, p. 133

...But Mr. Milyukov does not lose hope of the peasantry. “In spite of the existence of such obstacles” as “demagogy”, etc., he writes, “the possibility is not excluded of democratic constitutionalism acting *parallel* [Milyukov’s italics] to the direct expressions of the desires of the popular masses.”

Parallel activity!—there you have the new catchword for old liberal tactics. Parallel lines never meet. The bourgeois intellectuals have understood that their liberalism will *never* meet the masses, i.e., will not become *then* voice and leader in Russia—“never”, because of the growth of political consciousness after 1905. But the liberals of the Cadet type continue to count on the masses as a *stepping stone* to success, to domination. Translated into simple and clear language, to proceed “parallel” means to exploit the masses politically, trapping them with democratic words and betraying them in practice.

The Last Word of Russian Liberalism,
Vol. 16, pp 135-36

The subject indicated by the above title [The Historical Meaning of the Inner-Party Struggle in Russia] is dealt with in articles by Trotsky and Martov in Nos. 50 and 51 of *Neue Zeit*.⁴⁵ Martov expounds Menshevik views. Trotsky follows in the wake of the Mensheviks, taking cover behind particularly sonorous phrases....

Trotsky declares: “It is an illusion” to imagine that Menshevism and Bolshevism “have struck deep roots in the depths of the proletariat”. This is a specimen of the resonant but empty phrases of which our Trotsky is a master. The *roots* of the divergence between the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks lie, not in the “depths of the proletariat” but in the *economic content* of the Russian revolution.

The Historical Meaning of the Inner-Party Struggle in Russia, Vol. 16,
pp. 374, 375

* i.e. reactionary—Ed.

And here are you, teasing as it were ‘realism democracy, activity’”

Do you think these are good words? They are *bad* words, used by all the bourgeois tricksters in the world, from the Cadets and S R's in our country to Briand or Millerand here. Lloyd George in Britain, etc. The words are bad turgid and they carry a S R Cadet message. It's not good.

You think I have fallen into a contradiction? In the beginning of the letter I considered the words ‘realism, democracy, activity’ bad words and now I find them good? There is no contradiction here: what is bad for the proletariat is good for the bourgeois.

The Maxim Gorky January 5, 1911
Vol. 31 pp. 437-439

Hitherto we thought that our tasks were determined by the social structure of the society in which we act and that the forms of our activity were determined in the first place by these tasks and in the second place by *political conditions*. The social nature of the government has therefore no *direct* (but only *indirect* as Martov says) bearing on the determination of our tasks and forms of activity.

This is not an answer but in empty evasive phrase Martov again attempts to confuse the issue to shift the dispute to irrelevant ground. The question is not whether the social nature of the government is *directly* or *indirectly* connected with the tasks and forms of activity. Even if this connection is an *indirect* one it will in no way alter things once the close and indissoluble connection is recognised. Martov does not venture to say a *word* against the recognition of this close and indissoluble connection. His reference to ‘political conditions’ is nothing but cast thrown in the eyes of the reader. To draw a contrast between ‘the social nature of the government’ and the ‘political conditions’ is as senseless as if I were to contrast goloshes made by human hands to overshoes. Overshoes are goloshes. And there are no other goloshes than those made by human hands. The nature of the government corresponds to the ‘political conditions’. And the nature of the government can never be anything but social.

*The Social Structure of State Power: the
Prospects and Liquidationism* Vol. 17
pp. 151-55

This flippant tone—which at every serious turn of events gives way to gross bullying or even to brute force—is

accounted for by the fact that not only the Octobrists but the Cadets as well merely play for effect, exclusively for the sake of winning applause (and the Stolypins know this only too well) when they hurl phrases like: "God preserve us from such friends [i.e., from the Stolypins], we can cope with our enemies [meaning, apparently, the reactionaries on the Right, and—how can we express it in the mildest possible terms?—the "exacting" Left] ourselves."

Had these been more than mere words, Russia would by now have been entirely and irrevocably rid of "such friends". But the point is that the Cadets hurl such phrases only in the heat of "opposition" speeches—opposition speeches cannot be made from the national rostrum, unless they are given democratic flavour, even if only a slight one. That is why the Cadets sometimes give vent to democratic statements, which may be usefully compared with the *deeds* of these same Cadets. The historical role of a bourgeoisie playing at democracy (or threatening the enemy on the right with democracy) is such that this "playing" with words sometimes serves a useful purpose for some sections of the popular masses since it awakens sincere and profound democratic thought. "When the fiddle is played upstairs, people downstairs want to dance." There is a Latin proverb that says: *Littera scripta manet*—"what is written is permanent". Nor do spoken words always disappear, even if they are mere words and only spoken for effect.

It does not follow, of course, that hypocritical phrases uttered by the Cadets may be accepted at their face value, and that they may be proclaimed or regarded as an expression of democracy. But it certainly does follow that we ought to make use of every hypocritical phrase uttered by a Cadet so long as it has a democratic ring; that we ought to make use of it, first, to demonstrate the divergence between the words and the deeds of the man uttering them, and, secondly, to show what real, vital and direct significance democracy has for those masses who happen to get an inkling of the flamboyant phrases uttered by the speakers in the Taurida Palace.⁴⁶

The reflections of Mr. Teslenko quoted above are hypocritical, but not because Mr. Teslenko personally was hypocritical in his remarks; he may have been carried away by the torrent of his own oppositionist eloquence. The statement is

hypocritical because the *words* of the representative of the Cadet Party are at variance with the *deeds* of that party at all serious moments in modern Russian history.

The Results of the Duma Session,
Vol. 17, pp 207-08

...In the articles dealing with these subjects the essence of the liquidators'¹⁷ views is concealed behind an extraordinary number of inordinately inflated, laboured, high-sounding phrases about "the fighting mobilisation of the proletariat", "the widespread and open mobilisation of the masses", "political mass organisations of independent active workers", "self-governing groups", "class-conscious workers", etc., etc. Yuri Chatsky even went so far as to declare that the platform must be a "product" not only of "deep thought" but also of "keen feeling".... These phrases, which, doubtlessly, arouse the enthusiasm of high-school boys and girls, are intended to stun the readers, to "produce a smoke-screen", so as to make it easier for the writers to smuggle in their contraband.

From the Camp of the Stolypin "Labour"
Part, Vol. 17, p. 287

Or take the florid editorial grandly entitled "Onward!"¹⁸ "Class-conscious workers!" we read in that editorial. "At the present moment there is no more important [*sic!*] and comprehensive slogan [the poor fellow has let his tongue run away with him] than freedom of association, assembly, and strikes." "The Social-Democrats," we read further, "call upon the proletariat to fight for a republic. But if the fight for a republic is not to be merely the bare [!] slogan of a select few, it is necessary that you class-conscious workers should teach the masses to realise from experience the need for freedom of association and to fight for this most vital class demand."

This revolutionary phraseology merely serves to disguise and justify the falsity of liquidationism, and thereby to befuddle the minds of the workers. Why is the slogan calling for a republic the *bare* slogan of a *select few* when the existence of a republic means that it would be impossible to disperse the Duma, means freedom of association and of the press, means freeing the peasants from violence and plunder by the Markovs, Romanovs, and Purishkeviches? Is it not

clear that it is just the opposite—that it is the slogan of “freedom of association” as a “comprehensive” slogan, used *independently* of the slogan of a republic, that is “bare” and senseless?

Trotsky's Diplomacy and a Certain Party Platform, Vol. 17, p. 361

“The Regulations of June 12¹⁰ were intended to serve a purely political purpose.” What sort of language is this? How it reeks of hoary antiquity! Twenty-five or thirty years ago, in the cursed eighties of the past century, that was precisely the language *Russkiye Vedomosti*⁵⁰ used in criticising the government from the Zemstvo point of view. Wake up, Mr. Dzyubinsky! You have slept all through the first decade of the twentieth century. While you were asleep old Russia died and a new Russia came into being. In this new Russia you *cannot* use the language you do—reproaching the government for intending its regulations to serve a “purely political” purpose. With all the good intentions, manners, and benevolence of your language it is more reactionary than that of the reactionaries in the Third Duma. It is the language of people—or of provincial officials who fight shy of all politics—who regard “politics” as something in the nature of sorcery, and dream of a relief campaign “without politics”. The only way to speak to the Russia of today is to appeal for a change from one kind of politics to another, from the politics of one class to the politics of another class or other classes, from one political system to another. This is the ABC not only of democracy, but even of the most narrow liberalism—if we take the meaning of these political terms seriously.

Three Questions, Vol. 17, p. 139

...In *real life* the liberal bourgeoisie shares political privileges with the Purishkeviches, and their controversy is *only* over the question whether the Purishkeviches are to hold two-thirds of these privileges and the Milyukovs one third, or the other way round. Take “real life”, take the economic position of the present-day Russian peasantry as a stratum of small proprietors in agriculture, and you are sure to find that it is by no means a question of dividing political privileges, by no

means a question of political privileges at all, but that even the word "*life*" must be written in inverted commas, for the very existence of the Purishkeviches means *death from starvation* for millions of such petty proprietors

Liberalism and Democracy Vol. 17
p. 572

Mr. Vodovozov, without citing these arguments of mine fully and coherently, seeks to disprove them by disjointed statements. In reply to the first argument, for instance, he says "The peasantry is a mass of people living by their own labour, its interests are the interests of labour, and therefore it represents one contingent of the great army of labour, just as the workers represent another contingent of that army."¹

This is not Marxist, but bourgeois economic science: the phrase about the interests of labour here obscures the fundamental difference between the position of the small proprietor and that of the wage-worker. The worker owns no means of production and sells himself—his hands, his *labour-power*. The peasant does own means of production—implements, livestock, and his own or rented land—and sells the *products* of his farming, being a small proprietor, a small entrepreneur, a petty bourgeois.

The Trade-Unionists and the Worker Democrats Vol. 18 pp. 37-38

Take the following statement in Mr. Prokopovich's article: "The creation of sound conditions for the political life of the mass of the people—this is the immediate aim which at present unites the Lefts and the opposition."

Nothing could be more meaningless, more empty and misleading than this statement. Even an Octobrist, even an astute "nationalist", will subscribe to it, because it is so vague. It is a mere promise, sheer declamation, diplomatic concealment of one's thoughts. But if Mr. Prokopovich, like so many other liberals, has been given a tongue so that he may conceal his thoughts, we shall try to do our duty and reveal what is concealed behind his statement.

The Nature and Significance of Our Polemics Against the Liberals Vol. 18
p. 126

The newspaper *At Your Service*, *sn*, commonly known as *Novoye Vremya*,¹ has reprinted a report received by its

worthy colleague, *Peterburgskiy Vedomosti*, from Ivanovo-Voznesensk.

"In our industrial town," says the report, "foul language in the street has supplanted human speech. It is used by factory workers and cabbies and well-dressed people, and by policemen performing their official duties."

Commenting on this picture of mores, *Novoye Vremya* remarks:

"A lucky workers' town, where the most daring Social-Democratic expectations of completely unrestricted freedom of speech have been realised."

How very instructive, this caddish sally, isn't it?

Surely it is common knowledge, gentlemen of the editorial board of a newspaper loyally serving the government, that freedom of speech with regard to foul language has been "realised" in the Third Duma precisely by those Right-wing parties closest to the government. Surely everyone knows that the Purishkeviches, Markovs and *their* colleagues have become famous for this throughout Russia.⁵⁴

"Freedom of Speech" in Russia, Vol. 18,
p. 173

Suvorin's *Novoye Vremya* earned that nickname, *At Your Service, Sir*, for many decades to come. The newspaper became in Russia model example of the venal press. *Novoye Vremya* became an expression synonymous with the concepts of apostasy, renegacy and sycophancy. Suvorin's *Novoye Vremya* is a specimen of brisk trade, of how to sell stuff "for consumption off or on the premises". It deals in everything, from political convictions to pornographic advertisements.

A Career, Vol. 18, p. 275

We wholeheartedly recommend to the reader this clear and truthful argument *for* the Council of State⁵⁵ instead of the hackneyed, non-committal liberal phrases *against* the Council of State.

Shopkeepers in the Duma ... muzhiks, bears in the Zemstvo ... we shall admit no shopkeepers or muzhiks. There you have the plain language of a feudal-minded landlord.⁵⁶

And mind you, he is right, is this feudal lord, in saying that there is *no* majority in the Duma without the "shopkeepers", i.e., without the *bourgeoisie*, to use the language of a class-conscious worker (and not of a wild landlord⁵⁷). He is right, is this feudal lord, in saying that

self-government would in fact be *peasant* self-government (the class-conscious workers prefer the term *peasant* to *muzhik*, which is current among wild landlords) The peasants are a majority

Thank You for Your Frankness Vol 18,
pp 551 52

The intellectual Narodniks⁵⁸ gravitate towards conciliatory or "philanthropic" phrases. One always senses the liberal in them. The standpoint of the class struggle is wholly foreign to them. They are given to moralising. They are pulling the democratic peasantry *back* from the real and direct struggle against its class enemy to vague, forced, impotent, quasi-socialist phrase-mongering.

*What Goes On Among the Narodniks and
What Goes On in the Countryside*
Vol 18 p 555

We have underlined certain particularly characteristic words in this characteristic description of the countryside⁵⁹ by the mealy-mouthed little priest (a genuine Narodnik intellectual!)

The priest is a partisan of 'love' and an enemy of "hatred". In this respect he fully shares the Tolstoyan⁶⁰ (we may also say Christian), thoroughly reactionary point of view which our Cadets and Cadet-like people are constantly promoting. Such a priest would hardly mind dreaming of some sort of "socialisation of the land" or prattling about the 'socialist' significance of co-operation and about 'standards of landownership'. But when it came to hatred, instead of 'love', he at once recoiled, went limp and whimpered.

There is any amount of verbal, loud-mouthed "socialism" ('popular and not proletarian'), and in Europe too any literate philistine approves of it. But when it comes to 'hatred' instead of "love", that is the end. Socialism as humane phrase-mongering—yes, we are for it, revolutionary democracy—no, we are against it.

*What Goes On Among the Narodniks and
What Goes On in the Countryside*
Vol 18 pp 559 60

Recently the Cadet deputies conferred again with local leaders of that party.

As might have been expected, they discussed the features of the present political situation. The liberals appraised the situation as follows:

"Attention was drawn to the increasing discrepancy between the country's requirements for basic legislation and the impossibility of meeting them under the present system of legislative institutions and in view of the present attitude of the authorities towards popular representation."

The style is as tangled as a ball of wool with which a kitten has been playing for a long time. Our poor liberals—they have nowhere to express their ideas clearly!

But take a closer look: the trouble is not so much that the liberals have *nowhere* to talk as that they have *nothing* to say.

An Increasing Discrepancy. Notes of a Publicist, Vol. 18, p. 562

Our liberals in general—and they are followed by the liberal labour politicians (liquidators)—like to talk at length about the "Europeanisation" of Russia. A tiny little truth serves here as a cover for a big untruth.

There can be no doubt that Russia, speaking generally, is becoming Europeanised, i.e., reorganised in the image of Europe (moreover, in "Europe" we should now include Japan and China, in spite of geography). But this Europeanisation has been going on since Alexander II, or perhaps even since Peter the Great; it went on not only during the upswing (1905), but also *during reaction* (1908-11); it has been going on in the police and among the Markov-type landlords, who are "Europeanising" their methods of fighting the democratic movement.

The catchword "Europeanisation" turns out to be so general that it serves to obscure matters, to obscure urgent political issues.

An Increasing Discrepancy. Notes of a Publicist, Vol. 18, p. 563

...The duel⁶¹ throws a bright light on the relations as a whole that exist between the two "ruling" classes of Russia, the two so-called "higher" (but actually very low, despicable, plundering) classes, the class of feudal landowners and the class of financial tycoons.

The Owl Hunger, Vol. 19, p. 33

People always have been the foolish victims of deception and self-deception in politics, and they always will be until they have learnt to seek out the *interests* of some class or other behind all moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises.

*Three Sources and Three Component
Parts of Marxism*, Vol. 19, p. 28

That much is clear. All the activity of Messrs. Konovalovs—and, of course, not the Konovalovs alone, but all the liberals—has provided ample proof that the only means they regard as *available* are those which *do not undermine* the foundations of the welfare and the foundations of the privileges of Messrs. Purishkevich & Co.

There was need to attend the conference to expose for the thousandth time (we shall never tire of doing this) the fraud and to explain to the naïve, or ignorant, or slow-witted democrats the “gist” (or, if you want the straight truth, the *dist* and the *lie*) of the word “availability”.

This is the basest, the most loathsome, the most corrupt word in the Russian political vocabulary. From the standpoint of grammar it is ridiculous to say: “I recognise only available means”, for who does not know that the *unavailable* is not available? But the whole point is that the question is not a grammatical, but a political one. The workers do *not* regard as available the same things as Konovalov, Milyukov & Co. do.

Concerning the Editorial in the Newspaper “Luch”, No 189, Vol. 41, p. 284

The Australian Labour Party does not even call itself a socialist party. Actually it is a liberal-bourgeois party, while the so-called Liberals in Australia are really Conservatives.

This strange and incorrect use of terms in naming parties is not unique. In America, for example, the slave-owners of yesterday are called Democrats, and in France, enemies of socialism, petty bourgeois, are called Radical Socialists! In order to understand the real significance of parties, one must examine not their signboards but their class character and the historical conditions of each individual country.

In Australia, Vol. 19, p. 216

The bourgeoisie cannot influence the workers *directly* in contemporary Russia. As a result of 1905⁶² the workers jeer at the bourgeoisie and its liberalism. The word "Cadet" has become an expletive. And so the role of the bourgeoisie among the workers is played by the liquidators. Their objective significance is that they are the vehicle of bourgeois influence, bourgeois reformism and bourgeois opportunism.

Notes of a Publicist, Vol. 19, p. 231

A revolutionary is not one who becomes revolutionary with the onset of the revolution, but one who defends the principles and slogans of the revolution when reaction is most violent and when liberals and democrats vacillate to the greatest degree. A revolutionary is one who *teaches the masses* to struggle in a revolutionary manner and nobody can possibly foresee (make a "forecast" of) the results of that "teaching".

Notes of a Publicist, Vol. 19, pp. 231-32

...Like the Christian socialists⁶¹ (the worst variety of "socialism" and its worst distortion), you make use of a method which (despite your best intentions) repeats the hocus-pocus of the priests: you eliminate from the idea of God everything about it that is *historical and drawn from real life* (filth, prejudices, sanctified ignorance and degradation, on the one hand, serfdom and monarchy, on the other), and instead of the reality of history and life there is substituted in the idea of God a gentle petty-bourgeois phrase (God="ideas which awaken and organise social feelings").

Your wish in so doing is to say something "good and kind", to point out "truth and justice" and the like. But your good wish remains your personal affair, a subjective "innocent desire". Once you have written it down, it goes out among the *masses*, and its *significance* is determined not by your good wishes, but by the *relationship of social forces*, the objective relationship of classes.

To Maxim Gorky, November 1913,
Vol. 35, pp. 127-28

1. "Anarchy" is a silly catchword. It presupposes that there has been and still is in Germany an "established" civil, legal system which, on the instigation of the devil, has been

violated. The catchword "anarchy" is impregnated through and through with the spirit of official, university German "scholarship" (with apologies to real scholarship), the scholarship that cringes before the landowners and the militarists, and sings the praises of the exceptional "rule of law" in Germany.

Zabern, Vol 19, p. 514

There are certain winged words which most aptly express rather complex phenomena. Among these should undoubtedly be included the statement made by a certain landlord, member of the Right majority in the Duma, in connection with Goremykin's speech during the historic session of April 22.

"How nice it would be to have squire Goremykin for a neighbour!"

These words, uttered on the day the workers' and peasants' deputies were ejected from the Duma, are a very useful reminder now that these deputies have resumed their seats.⁶⁴ These words admirably describe the force which the democrats have to contend with within the Duma and outside it.

The petty squire who uttered these winged words spoke them in jest but he unwittingly voiced a truth that was more serious and profound than he had intended. Indeed, take the whole of this Fourth Duma, the whole of this majority of Rights and Octobrists, and all the "bigwigs" in the Council of State—what are they all if not "neighbouring squires"?

"Neighbouring Squires", Vol. 20,
p. 284

The manifesto⁶⁵ calls the war imperialist and emphasises two features of imperialism: the striving of the capitalists of *every* nation for profits and the exploitation of others, and the striving of the Great Powers to partition the world and "enslave" weaker nations. The manifesto repeats the most essential things that should be said of the imperialist nature of the war, and were said in our resolution. In this respect, the manifesto merely *popularises* our resolution. Popularisation is undoubtedly a useful thing. However, if we want clear thinking in the working class and attach importance to systematic and unflagging propaganda, we must accurately

and fully define the principles to be popularised. If that is not done, we risk repeating the error, the fault of the Second International⁶⁶ which led to its collapse, viz., we shall be leaving room for ambiguity and misinterpretations....

Let us take a look at what has come about: To make the masses see things in a clearer light, the manifesto says that in the present war the defence of the fatherland idea is a capitalist lie. The European masses, however, are not illiterate, and almost all who have read the manifesto have heard, and still hear *that same lie* from hundreds of socialist papers, journals, and pamphlets, echoing it after Plekhanov, Hyndman, Kautsky and Co.⁶⁷ What will the readers of the manifesto think? What thoughts will arise in them after this display of timidity by the authors of the manifesto? Disregard the capitalists' lie about the defence of the fatherland, the manifesto tells the workers. Well and good. Practically all of them will say or think: the *capitalists'* lie has long stopped bothering us, but the lie of Kautsky and Co....

The First Step, Vol. 21, pp. 384, 385

What, then, are the arguments used by *Rabocheye Utro*⁶⁸ to defend its stand of "defence of the country" or "social-chauvinism"? These are, without exception, examples of evasion and of internationalist phrases!...

Each of these claims is a gem, to say the least. Besides ignorance and Repetilov-like⁶⁹ lying, however, all these gems contain a diplomacy that is perfectly sober and *correct* from the bourgeois point of view. To influence the workers, the bourgeois must assume the guise of socialists, Social-Democrats, internationalists, and the like, for otherwise they can exert no influence. The *Rabocheye Utro* group disguise themselves: they apply plenty of paint and powder, prettify themselves, cast sheep eyes all around, and go the limit! They are ready to sign the Zimmerwald Manifesto a hundred times (a slap in the face for those Zimmerwaldists who signed the Manifesto without combating its timidity or making reservations!) or any other resolution on the imperialist nature of the war, or take any oath of allegiance to "internationalism" and "revolutionism" ("liberation of the country" in the censored press being the equivalent of "revolution" in the underground press), if only—if only they are not prevented from calling upon the workers to

participate in the war industries committees,⁷⁰ i.e., in *practice* to participate in the reactionary war of plunder ("a war of defence").

Only this is action; all the rest is words. Only this is reality; all the rest is phrases. *Only this is needed* by the police, by the tsarist monarchy, Khvostov and the bourgeoisie. The clever bourgeois in countries that are cleverer are more tolerant of internationalist and socialist phrases if only participation in defence is assured, as is evidenced by comment in the French reactionary press regarding the London Conference of the socialists of the "Triple Entente".⁷¹ With the socialist gentry, one of these papers said, it's a kind of *tic douloureux*, a species of nervous malady which forces people involuntarily to repeat the same gesture, the same muscular movement, the same word. It is for that reason, the paper said, that "our own" socialists cannot speak about anything without repeating the words, "We are internationalists; we stand for social revolution". This is not dangerous, the bourgeois paper concludes, only a "tic"; what is important to "us" is their stand *for the defence* of the country.

That is how the clever French and British bourgeois reason. If participation in a war of plunder is defended with phrases about democracy, socialism, etc., is this not to the advantage of rapacious governments, the imperialist bourgeoisie? Is it not to the master's advantage to keep a lackey who swears to all and sundry that his master loves them, and has dedicated his life to their welfare?

*Social-Chauvinist Policy Behind a Cover
of Internationalist Phrases*, Vol. 21,
pp. 431, 433

...The real policy of the London and Vienna heroes⁷² of social-chauvinism is to justify participation in the imperialist war, to justify the killing of German workers by French workers, and vice versa, over which national bourgeoisie shall have the advantage in robbing other countries. And to conceal their real policy, to deceive the workers, both the London and the Vienna heroes resort to the *phrase*, we "recognise" the "independence of nations" or, in other words, recognise the self-determination of nations, repudiate annexations, etc., etc.

The Peace Programme, Vol. 22,
pp. 161-62

...That's the very thing the bourgeoisie wants; it wants the workers *diverted* from the revolutionary struggle in war-time by means of hypocritical, idle and non-committal phrases about peace; it wants them lulled and soothed by hopes of "peace without annexations", a democratic peace, etc., etc.

The Peace Programme, Vol. 22, p. 162

. But this general, theoretical question automatically arises: What is at the root of the falsehood of such arguments; how can the hypocrisy of the German imperialists be exposed with unerring certainty? The correct theoretical answer pointing to the root of falsehood always serves as a means of exposing the hypocrites who, for reasons all too obvious, are inclined to cover up their falsehood, to obscure it, to clothe it in flowery phrases, all sorts of phrases, phrases about everything in the world, even about internationalism.

German and Non-German Chauvinism,
Vol. 22, p. 183

This pamphlet was written with an eye to the tsarist censorship. Hence, I was not only forced to confine myself strictly to an exclusively theoretical, specifically economic analysis of facts, but to formulate the few necessary observations on politics with extreme caution, by hints, in an allegorical language—in that accursed Aesopian language—to which tsarism compelled all revolutionaries to have recourse whenever they took up the pen to write a "legal" work.

It is painful, in these days of liberty, to re-read the passages of the pamphlet which have been distorted, cramped, compressed in an iron vice on account of the censor.⁷¹ That the period of imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution; that social-chauvinism (socialism in words, chauvinism in deeds) is the utter betrayal of socialism, complete desertion to the side of the bourgeoisie; that this split in the working-class movement is bound up with the objective conditions of imperialism, etc.—on these matters I had to speak in a "slavish" tongue, and I must refer the reader who is interested in the subject to the articles I wrote abroad in 1914-17, a new edition of which is soon to appear. Special attention should be drawn to a passage on pages 119-20. In order to show the reader, in a guise acceptable to

the censors, how shamelessly untruthful the capitalists and the social-chauvinists who have deserted to their side (and whom Kautsky opposes so inconsistently) are on the question of annexations, in order to show how shamelessly they *screen* the annexations of *their* capitalists, I was forced to quote as an example—Japan! The careful reader will easily substitute Russia for Japan, and Finland, Poland, Courland,¹ the Ukraine, Khiva, Bokhara, Estonia or other regions peopled by non-Great Russians, for Korea

Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism Preface Vol. 22 pp. 157-88

The chief defect in Junius's pamphlet,⁷ and what marks a definite step backward compared with the legal (although immediately suppressed) magazine, *Internationale*,⁸ is its silence regarding the connection between social-chauvinism (the author uses neither this nor the less precise term social patriotism) and opportunism

The Junius Pamphlet Vol. 22 p. 306

Kievsky gets round the theoretical difficulties by the very simple and superficial dodge, known in German as "*burschikose*" phraseology, i.e., primitive, crude phrases heard (and quite naturally) at student binges. Here is an example

Universal suffrage, he writes, "the eight hour day and even the republic are *logically* compatible with imperialism though imperialism far from smiles [!] on them and their achievement is therefore extremely difficult

We would have absolutely no objections to the *burschikose* statement that imperialism far from 'smiles' on the republic—a frivolous word can sometimes lend colour to a scientific polemic!—if in this polemic on a serious issue we were given, *in addition*, an economic and political analysis of the concepts involved. With Kievsky, however, the *burschikose* phrase does duty for such an analysis or serves to conceal lack of it

A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism Vol. 23 p. 15

Kievsky wants to refute that by angrily calling us 'rationalists' (What has that to do with it? The rationalist confines himself to purely abstract discussions, while we have pointed to a very concrete fact! But perhaps Kievsky is using

the foreign word "rationalist" in the same ... how to put it more mildly?... in the same "unhappy" manner he used the word "extractive" at the beginning of his article, when he presented his arguments "in extractive form"?)

A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, Vol. 23, p. 48

1) He [P. Kievsky] is unaware that a national uprising is *also* "defence of the fatherland"! A little thought, however, will make it perfectly clear that it is so, since *every* "nation in revolt" "defends" itself, its language, its territory, its fatherland, against the oppressor nation.

A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, Vol. 23, p. 61

That is what the proclamation of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet to the socialists of the world,⁷⁸ published in today's papers, amounts to. It has a lot to say against imperialism, but all these words are nullified by a single little phrase which reads:

"The Provisional Government of revolutionary Russia has adopted this platform" (i.e., peace without annexations and indemnities on the basis of self-determination of nations).

The gist of the matter is summed up in this one phrase. This phrase is a defence of *Russian* imperialism, which it cloaks and whitewashes. As a matter of fact, our Provisional Government, far from "adopting" a platform of peace without annexations, is trampling upon it daily and hourly....

The Executive Committee's proclamation covers up its lies about annexations with specious phrases, and thereby does great harm to the cause of the proletariat and the revolution. First of all, the proclamation does not differentiate between the renunciation of annexations in words (in this sense, *all* capitalist governments, without exception, have "adopted" the "platform of peace without annexations") and *renunciation of annexations in deeds* (in this sense, *not one* capitalist government in the world has renounced annexations). Secondly, the proclamation—without any justification, without any basis, contrary to the truth—whitewashes the *Russian* Provisional Government of the capitalists, which is not a bit better (and, probably, not worse) than any other capitalist government.

To cloak an unpleasant truth with a specious phrase is most harmful and most dangerous to the cause of the proletariat, to the cause of the toiling masses. The truth, however bitter, must be faced squarely. A policy that does not meet this requirement is a ruinous policy.

*Defence of Imperialism Cloaked with
Specious Phrases* Vol. 24 pp. 340-341

The bitter truth that capitalism cannot be reconciled to a non-annexationist policy has been exposed once more. The policy of the "conciliators", of those who wish to reconcile the capitalists and the proletariat, the policy of the Narodnik and Menshevik ministerialists¹ is an obvious failure. All their hopes on a coalition government have been shattered, all their promises have been exposed as mere verbiage.

And most harmful of all, as far as the cause of the revolution and the interests of the toiling masses are concerned, is the attempt to cover up the whole thing with phrases. Two shadings stand out in this torrent of phrases, one as bad as the other.

Rabochaya Gazeta, the organ of the Menshevik ministerialists, brings grist to the Cadet mill. On the one hand, it says "On this basis [on the basis of the answers of the two Allied powers⁸⁰] there can be no agreement between them and us." When they say "us", do they mean the Russian capitalists? The theory of the class struggle is thrown overboard, it is much more profitable to spout phrases about "democracy" in the abstract, while trampling underfoot the elementary truth of Marxism—namely, that it is precisely *within* a "democracy" that the gulf between the capitalists and the proletarians is widest.

We have *Dyelo Naroda*⁸¹ phrase-mongering "à la Jacobin". That stein tone, those spectacular revolutionary exclamations "we know enough" "faith in the victory of our Revolution" (with a capital letter, of course), "upon this or that step" of the Russian revolutionary democracy depend the destinies of the *entire* Uprising [with a capital letter, of course] which the working people have so happily and so victoriously begun."

Obviously, if you write the words Revolution and Uprising with capital letters it makes the thing look "awfully" frightening, just like the Jacobins. Plenty of effect at small

expense. For the people who write this are virtually helping to crush the revolution and impede the uprising of the working people by supporting the *Russian* government of the imperialists, by supporting *their* methods of concealing from the people the secret treaties, *their* tactics of putting off the immediate abolition of the landed estates, by supporting *their* war policy of "offensive", *their* high-handed insulting behaviour towards the local representative bodies, *their* presumption to appoint or endorse the local officers elected by the local population, and so on *ad infinitum*.

The Harm of Phrase-Mongering,
Vol. 24, pp. 546-48

...That the state is an organ of the rule of a definite class which *cannot* be reconciled with its antipode (the class opposite to it) is something the petty-bourgeois democrats will never be able to understand. Their attitude to the state is one of the most striking manifestations of the fact that our Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks are not socialists at all (a point that we Bolsheviks have always maintained), but petty-bourgeois democrats using near-socialist phraseology.

The State and Revolution, Vol. 25,
p. 393

...The term "revolutionary democracy" has become with us (especially among the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks) almost a conventional phrase, like the expression "thank God", which is also used by people who are not so ignorant as to believe in God; or like the expression "honourable citizen", which is sometimes used even in addressing staff members of *Dyen* or *Yedinstvo*, although nearly everybody guesses that these newspapers have been founded and are maintained by the capitalists in the interests of the capitalists, and that there is therefore very little "honourable" about the pseudo-socialists contributing to these newspapers.

If we do not employ the phrase "revolutionary democracy" as a stereotyped ceremonial phrase, as a conventional epithet, but *reflect* on its meaning, we find that to be a democrat means reckoning in reality with the interests of the majority of the people and not the minority, and that to be a

revolutionary means destroying everything harmful and obsolete in the most resolute and ruthless manner.

The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It, Vol. 25, p. 337

...One of the objectors declared that we had favoured the dictatorship of democracy, that we had recognised the rule of democracy. That declaration was so absurd, so utterly meaningless, that it is merely a collection of words. It was just like saying "iron snow", or something similar. (*Laughter.*) Democracy is a form of bourgeois state championed by all traitors to genuine socialism, who now find themselves at the head of official socialism and who assert that democracy is contrary to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Until the revolution transcended the limits of the bourgeois system, we were for democracy; but as soon as we saw the first signs of socialism in the progress of the revolution, we took a firm and resolute stand for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is strange that people who cannot or refuse to understand this plain truth, this definition of the meaning of the terms "democracy" and "dictatorship of the proletariat", should make bold to bring before so numerous an assembly old, utterly worthless rubbish, such as that in which all the objecting gentlemen's speeches abound....

Concluding Speech on the Report of the Council of People's Commissars, January 12 (25), 1918, Third All-Russia Congress of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, Vol. 26, p. 173

The flaunting of high-sounding phrases is characteristic of the declassed petty-bourgeois intellectuals. The organised proletarian Communists will certainly punish this "habit" with nothing less than derision and expulsion from all responsible posts. The people must be told the bitter truth simply, clearly and in a straightforward manner: it is possible, and even probable, that the war party will again get the upper hand in Germany (that is, an offensive against us will commence at once), and that Germany together with Japan, by official agreement or by tacit understanding, will partition and strangle us.⁸² Our tactics, if we do not want to listen to the ranters, must be to wait, procrastinate, avoid battle and retreat. If we shake off the ranters and "brace

ourselves" by creating genuinely iron, genuinely proletarian, genuinely communist discipline, we shall have a good chance of gaining many months. And then by retreating even, if the worst comes to the worst, to the Urals, we shall *make it easier* for our ally (the international proletariat) to come to our aid, to "catch up" (to use the language of sport) the distance between the beginning of revolutionary outbreaks and revolution.

"Left-Wing" Childishness and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality, Vol. 27, pp. 330-31

...This British bourgeois newspaper [*The Manchester Guardian*] writes: "If the Allied armies still remain in Russia and still operate in Russia, their purpose can only be to effect a revolution in ... Russia. The Allied governments must, therefore, either ... put an end to their operations in Russia or announce that they are at war with Bolshevism."⁸⁹

I repeat that the significance of this small quotation, which sounds to us like a revolutionary call, like a powerful revolutionary appeal, is that it is written by a bourgeois newspaper, which is itself an enemy of the socialists, but feels that the truth can no longer be hidden. If bourgeois papers write in this vein you can imagine what the British workers must be thinking and saying. You know the sort of language used by the liberals in tsarist times, prior to the 1905 and 1917 revolutions. You know this language heralded an impending explosion amidst the revolutionary proletariat. From the language of these British bourgeois liberals, therefore, you can draw conclusions about what is going on in the moods, minds and hearts of the British, French and American workers.

Speech on the International Situation, November 8, 1918, Extraordinary Sixth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, Vol 28, pp 162-63

...It is a rare thing to receive a copy of the Italian newspaper *Avanti!*, the organ of the Italian Socialist Party, a party which participated in Zimmerwald,⁸¹ fought against the war and has now resolved not to attend the yellow congress in Berne,⁸⁵ the congress of the old International, which was to be attended by people who had helped their governments to prolong this criminal war. To this day, *Avanti!* is under

strict censorship. But in this issue, which arrived here by chance, I read an item on party life in a small locality called Cavriago (probably a remote spot because it cannot be located on the map). It appears that the workers there adopted a resolution supporting their newspaper for its uncompromising stand and declared their approval of the German Spartacists.⁸⁶ Then follow the words "*Sovietisti russi*" which, even though they are in Italian, can be understood all over the world. They sent greetings to the Russian "*Sovietisti*" and expressed the wish that the programme of the Russian and German revolutionaries should be adopted throughout the world and serve to carry the fight against the bourgeoisie and military domination to a conclusion. When you read a resolution like that, adopted in some Italian Poshekhonye,⁸⁷ you have every right to say to yourself that the Italian people are on our side, the Italian people understand what the Russian "*Sovietisti*" are, what the programme of the Russian "*Sovietisti*" and the German Spartacists is. Yet at that time we had no such programme! We had no common programme with the German Spartacists, but the Italian workers rejected all they had seen in their bourgeois press, which, bribed as it is by the millionaires and multimillionaires, spreads slander about us in millions of copies. It failed to deceive the Italian workers, who grasped what the Spartacists and the "*Sovietisti*" were and declared that they sympathised with their programme, at a time when this programme did not exist. That is why we found our task so easy at this Congress. All we had to do was to record as a programme what had already been implanted in the minds and hearts of the workers, even those cast away in some remote spot and cut off from us by police and military cordons. That is why we have been able to reach concerted decisions on all the main issues with such ease and complete unanimity. And we are fully convinced that these decisions will meet with a powerful response among workers elsewhere.

The Soviet movement comrades, is the form which has been won in Russia, which is now spreading throughout the world and the very name of which gives the workers a complete programme.

Founding of the Communist International
at Vol. 28 pp. 182-83

Owing to their economic status in bourgeois society the peasants must follow either the workers or the bourgeoisie. *There is no middle way.* They may waver, become confused, conjure up all sorts of things; they may blame, swear, curse the "bigoted" representatives of the proletariat and the "bigoted" representatives of the bourgeoisie and say that they are the minority. You may curse them, talk loud about the majority, about the broad universal character of your labour democracy, about pure democracy. There is no end to the number of words you can string together, but they will only serve to obscure the fact that if the peasants do not follow the lead of the workers they will follow the lead of the bourgeoisie. There is not, nor can there be, a middle course.

*Speech of Greeting, May 6, 1919, First
All-Russia Congress on Adult Education,
Vol. 29, p. 370*

In *Capital*, Karl Marx ridicules the pompous and grandiloquent bourgeois-democratic great charter of liberty and the rights of man, ridicules all this phrase-mongering about liberty, equality and fraternity *in general*, which dazzles the petty bourgeois and philistines of all countries, including the present despicable heroes of the despicable Berne International. Marx contrasts these pompous declarations of rights to the plain, modest, practical, simple manner in which the question is presented by the proletariat—the legislative enactment of a shorter working day is a typical example of such treatment. The aptness and profundity of Marx's observation become the clearer and more obvious to us the more the content of the proletarian revolution unfolds. The "formulas" of genuine communism differ from the pompous, intricate, and solemn phraseology of the Kautskys, the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries and their beloved "brethren" of Berne in that they reduce everything to the *conditions of labour*. Less chatter about "labour democracy", about "liberty, equality and fraternity", about "government by the people", and all such stuff; the class-conscious workers and peasants of our day see through these pompous phrases of the bourgeois intellectual and discern the trickery as easily as a person of ordinary common sense and experience, when glancing at the irreproachably "polished" features and immaculate appearance of the "fain fellow,

don'tcher know', immediately and uncritically puts him down as 'in all probability, a scoundrel'

Fewer pompous phrases more plain *everyday* work, concern for the pood of grain and the pood of coal!

A Great Beginning Heroism of the
Workers in the Red Communist
Subbotniks Vol. 29 pp. 427-28

Ramsay MacDonald's article⁴ is a fine specimen of the smooth euphonious hackneyed apparently socialistic phrases which have long served in all the advanced capitalist countries to conceal bourgeois policy within the working-class movement

The Last of the Third International
Vol. 29 p. 497

Bourgeois democracy is the democracy of pompous phrases solemn words lavish promises and high sounding slogans about *freedom and equality* but in practice all this cloaks the lack of freedom and the inequality of women the lack of freedom and the inequality for the working and exploited people

Soviet or socialist democracy sweeps away these pompous but false words and declares ruthless war on the hypocrisy of democrats landowners capitalists and farmers with bursting bins who are piling up wealth by selling surplus grain to the starving workers at profiteering prices

So let Peace and the Statue of Women
Vol. 30 p. 121

The mere presentation of the question—dictatorship of the party *or* dictatorship of the class dictatorship (party) of the leaders *or* dictatorship (party) of the masses—testifies to most incredibly and hopelessly muddled thinking. These people want to *invent* something quite out of the ordinary, and in their effort to be clever make themselves ridiculous. It is common knowledge that the masses are divided into classes that the masses can be contrasted with classes only by contrasting the vast majority in general, regardless of division according to status in the social system of production, with categories holding a definite status in the social system of production, that as a rule and in most cases—at

least in present-day civilised countries—classes are led by political parties, that political parties, as a general rule, are run by more or less stable groups composed of the most authoritative, influential and experienced members, who are elected to the most responsible positions, and are called leaders. All this is elementary. All this is clear and simple. Why replace this with some kind of rigmarole, some new Volapuk?⁸⁹

Left Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder Vol. 31 p. 41

In that case the only difference between us lies in their avoidance of the word "party" because there exists among the British comrades a certain mistrust of political parties. They can conceive of political parties only in the image of the parties of Gompers and Henderson, parties of parliamentary smart dealers and traitors to the working class. But if, by parliamentarianism, they mean what exists in Britain and America today, then we too are opposed to such parliamentarianism and to such political parties. What we want is new and different parties. We want parties that will be in constant and real contact with the masses and will be able to lead those masses.

Speech on the Role of the Communist Party, June 23, Second Congress of the Communist International Vol. 31 p. 236

These reports show that it is technically quite feasible to broadcast human speech over any distance by wireless, furthermore, it is also possible to use many hundreds of stations that could broadcast speeches, reports and lectures delivered in Moscow to many hundreds of places throughout the Republic, situated hundreds and, under certain conditions, thousands of versts away from Moscow.

I think that from the standpoint of propaganda and agitation, especially for those masses of the population who are illiterate, and also for broadcasting lectures, it is absolutely necessary for us to carry out this plan. Considering the unfitness of most of the bourgeois professors of social sciences whom we are using and even the harm caused by them, we have no other way out than to enable our few

communist professors, who are capable of delivering lectures on social sciences, to deliver these lectures for hundreds of localities in all parts of the Federation

*Letters to J. V. Stalin for Members of the
Political Bureau of the C. C. R. C. P. (B.)
on the Promotion of Radio Engineering*
Vol. 33 pp. 360-61

IV. THE NATIONAL QUESTION AND LANGUAGE POLICY

It is not without interest to note here the specific jargon of the inhabitants of Krasnoye, this is characteristic of the territorial isolation peculiar to manufacture "In the village of Krasnoye factories are given the *Matroisk* name of *povarnyas* (lit. kitchens—*Ed*) *Matroisk* is one of the numerous branches of the Ophén⁹⁰ dialect, the three main branches of which are *Ophen* proper, spoken mainly in Vladimir Gubernia, *Galvon*, in Kostroma Gubernia, and *Matroisk*, in Nizhni-Novgorod and Vladimir Gubernias" (*Transactions of the Handicraft Commission*, V, p. 465) Only large-scale machine industry completely destroys the local character of social ties and replaces them by national (and international) ties

The Development of Capitalism in Russia Vol. 3 p. 392 footnote

2) Insert new point¹¹

"The right of the population to receive education in the native language, the right of each citizen to use the native language at meetings and in public and state institutions"

Proposals on Various Points of the General Political Demands of the Party Programme Second Congress of the RSDLP Vol. 41 p. 87

The next major incident to arise at the Congress after the Organising Committee incident¹² was in connection with equality of languages, or, as it was ironically called at the Congress, "freedom of tongues" (*Martov* "On the 'asses'" *Laughter*) Yes, and the "asses" The point was this. The draft Party programme spoke of equal rights for all citizens irrespective of sex, nationality, religion, etc. This was not enough for the Bundists,¹³ and they wanted to write into the programme the right of every nationality to receive tuition in its own language and to use it in addressing public and state institutions. When a garrulous Bundist referred, by way of example, to state stud farms, Comrade Plekhanov remarked

that stud farms had nothing to do with it, as horses do not talk—"only asses do". The Bundists took offence at this, evidently thinking the jest was meant for them

*Report on the Second Congress of the
RSDLP Second Congress of the
League of Russian Revolutionary Social
Democracy Abroad Vol 7 pp 78-79*

It is useless for the P S P⁹¹ to pretend that it differs from the German or Russian Social-Democrats in their rejection of the right to self-determination, the right to strive for a free and independent republic. It is not this, but the fact that it loses sight of the class point of view, obscures it by chauvinism and disrupts the unity of the present-day political struggle, that prevents us from regarding the P S P as a genuine Social-Democratic workers' party. This, for instance, is how the P S P usually presents the question "We can only weaken tsarism by wresting Poland from it, it is the task of the Russian comrades to overthrow it." Or again "After the overthrow of tsarism we would simply decide our fate by seceding from Russia." See to what monstrous conclusions this monstrous logic leads, even from the viewpoint of the programme demand for Poland's restoration. *Because* the restoration of Poland is one of the possible (but, whilst the bourgeoisie rules, by no means absolutely certain) consequences of democratic evolution, *therefore* the Polish proletariat must not fight together with the Russian proletariat to overthrow tsarism, but "only" to weaken it by wresting Poland from it. *Because* Russian tsarism is concluding a closer and closer alliance with the bourgeoisie and the governments of Germany, Austria, etc., *therefore* the Polish proletariat must weaken its alliance with the proletariat of Russia, Germany, etc., together with whom it is now fighting against *one and the same yoke*. This is nothing more than sacrificing the most vital interests of the proletariat to the bourgeois-democratic conception of national independence. The disintegration of Russia which the P S P desires, as *distinct from* our aim of overthrowing tsarism, is and will remain an empty phrase, as long as economic development continues to bring the different parts of a political whole more and more closely together, and as long as the bourgeoisie of all countries unite more and more closely against their common enemy, the

proletariat, and in support of their common ally, the tsar. But *the division of forces of the proletariat*, which is now suffering under the yoke of this autocracy, is the sad reality, the direct consequence of the error of the P.S.P., the direct outcome of its worship of bourgeois-democratic formulas. To turn a blind eye to this division of the proletariat, the P.S.P. has to stoop to chauvinism and present the views of the Russian Social-Democrats as follows: "We [the Poles] must wait for the social revolution, and until then we must patiently endure national oppression." This is an utter falsehood. The Russian Social-Democrats have never advised anything of the sort; on the contrary, they themselves fight, and call upon the whole Russian proletariat to fight, against all manifestations of national oppression in Russia; they include in *their* programme not only complete equality of status for all languages, nationalities, etc., but also recognition of every nation's right to determine its own destiny. Recognising this right, we *subordinate* to the interests of the proletarian struggle our support of the demand for national independence, and only a chauvinist can interpret our position as an expression of a Russian's mistrust of a non-Russian, for in reality this position necessarily follows from the class-conscious proletarian's distrust of the bourgeoisie. The P.S.P. takes the view that the national question is *exhausted* by the contrast—"we" (Poles) and "they" (Germans, Russians, etc.). The Social-Democrat, however, gives first place to the contrast—"we", the proletarians, and "they", the bourgeoisie. "We", the proletarians, have seen dozens of times how the bourgeoisie *betrays* the interests of freedom, motherland, language, and nation, when it is confronted with the revolutionary proletariat.

The National Question in Our Programme, Vol. 6, pp. 458-60

Hence, neither the "logical analysis" of autonomy nor the appeals to history can provide even the shadow of a "principle" justifying the isolation of the Bund.⁹⁵ But the Bund's third argument, which invokes the idea of a Jewish nation, is undoubtedly of the nature of a principle. Unfortunately, however, this Zionist idea is absolutely false and essentially reactionary. "The Jews have ceased to be a nation, for a nation without a territory is unthinkable," says

one of the most prominent of Marxist theoreticians, Karl Kautsky (see No. 42 of *Iskra* and the separate reprint from it *The Kishinev Massacre and the Jewish Question*, p. 3). And quite recently, examining the problem of nationalities in Austria, the same writer endeavoured to give a scientific definition of the concept nationality and established two principal criteria of a nationality: language and territory (*Neue Zeit*, 1903, No. 2). A French Jew, the radical Alfred Naquet, says practically the same thing, word for word, in his controversy with the anti-Semites and the Zionists. "If it pleased Bernard Lazare," he writes of the well-known Zionist, "to consider himself a citizen of a separate nation, that is his affair; but I declare that, although I was born a Jew ... I do not recognise Jewish nationality.... I belong to no other nation but the French.... Are the Jews a nation? Although they were one in the remote past, my reply is a categorical *negative*. The concept nation implies certain conditions which do not exist in this case. A nation must have a territory on which to develop. and, in our time at least, until a world confederation has extended this basis, a nation must have a common language. And the Jews no longer have either a territory or a common language.... Like myself, Bernard Lazare probably did not know a word of Hebrew, and would have found it no easy matter, if Zionism had achieved its purpose, to make himself understood to his co-racials [*congénères*] from other parts of the world" (*La Petite République*, September 24, 1903). "German and French Jews are quite unlike Polish and Russian Jews. The characteristic features of the Jews include nothing that bears the imprint [*empreinte*] of nationality. If it were permissible to recognise the Jews as a nation, as Drumont does, it would be an artificial nation. The modern Jew is a product of the unnatural selection to which his forebears were subjected for nearly eighteen centuries." All that remains for the Bundists is to develop the theory of a separate Russian-Jewish nation, whose language is Yiddish and their territory the Pale of Settlement.

Absolutely untenable scientifically,* the idea that the Jews

* Not only national, but even racial peculiarities are denied to the Jews by modern scientific investigators, who give prime prominence to the peculiarities of the *history* of the Jews. "Do the peculiarities of Jewry spring from its racial character?" Karl Kautsky asks, and replies that we do not even know with precision what race means. "There is no need to bring in

form a separate nation is reactionary politically. Irrefutable practical proof of that is furnished by generally known facts of recent history and of present-day political realities. All over Europe, the decline of medievalism and the development of political liberty went hand in hand with the political emancipation of the Jews, their abandonment of Yiddish for the language of the people among whom they lived, and, in general, their undeniable progressive assimilation with the surrounding population. Are we again to revert to the exceptionalist theories and proclaim that Russia will be the one exception, although the Jewish emancipation movement is far broader and deeper-rooted here, thanks to the awakening of a heroic class-consciousness among the Jewish proletariat? Can we possibly attribute to chance the fact that it is the reactionary forces all over Europe, and especially in Russia, who *oppose* the assimilation of the Jews and try to perpetuate their isolation?

That is precisely what the Jewish problem *amounts to*: assimilation or isolation?—and the idea of a Jewish “nationality” is definitely reactionary not only when expounded by its consistent advocates (the Zionists), but likewise on the lips of those who try to combine it with the ideas of Social-Democracy (the Bundists). The idea of a Jewish nationality runs counter to the interests of the Jewish proletariat, for it fosters among them, directly or indirectly, a spirit hostile to assimilation, the spirit of the “ghetto”. “When the National Assembly of 1791 decreed the emancipation of the Jews,” writes Renan, “it was very little concerned with the question of race.... It is the business of the nineteenth century to abolish all ‘ghettos’, and I cannot compliment those who seek to restore them. The Jewish race has rendered the world the greatest services. Assimilated with the various nations, harmoniously blended with the various national units, it will render no lesser services in the future than in the past.” And Karl Kautsky, in particular reference to the Russian Jews,

the concept race, which provides no real answer but only poses new problems. It is enough to trace the history of the Jews to ascertain the reasons for their characteristics.” And such an expert in this history as Renan says: “The characteristic features of the Jews and their manner of life are far more a product of the social conditions [*nécessités sociales*] by which they have been influenced for centuries than a racial distinction [*phénomène de race*].”

expresses himself even more vigorously. Hostility towards non-native sections of the population can only be eliminated "when the non-native sections of the population cease to be alien and blend with the general mass of the population. *That is the only possible solution of the Jewish problem, and we should support everything that makes for the ending of Jewish isolation.*" Yet the Bund is resisting this only possible solution, for it is helping, not to end but to increase and legitimise Jewish isolation, by propagating the idea of a Jewish "nation" and a plan of federating Jewish and non-Jewish proletarians. That is the basic mistake of "Bundism", which consistent Jewish Social-Democrats must and will correct.

The Position of the Bund in the Party,
Vol. 7. pp. 99-101

2. This meeting therefore calls earnestly on the workers of all the nationalities of Russia to rebuff the militant nationalism of the reactionaries with the utmost determination, to combat all manifestations of a nationalist spirit among the working masses. It calls on the worker Social-Democrats locally to display the closest solidarity, and to merge into integral organisations of the R.S.D.L.P. working in all the languages spoken by the local proletariat and achieving real unity from below, as has long been done in the Caucasus.

*Notification and Resolutions of the
Cracow Meeting of the Central Committee
of the R.S.D.L.P. and Party Functionaries,* Vol. 18, p. 465

But we must beware of any national struggle within Social-Democracy because it would militate against the great task of revolutionary struggle; in that respect the national struggle in Austria should be a warning to us. The Caucasian Social-Democrats should be a model for Russia; they conducted propaganda simultaneously in the Georgian, Armenian, Tatar and Russian languages.

*Contemporary Russia and the Working-
Class Movement,* Vol. 19, p. 51

For different nations to live together in peace and freedom or to separate and form different states (if that is more convenient for them), a full democracy, upheld by the

working class, is essential. No privileges for any nation or any one language! Not even the slightest degree of oppression or the slightest injustice in respect of a national minority—such are the principles of working-class democracy.

The capitalists and landowners want, at all costs, to keep the workers of different nations apart while the powers that be live splendidly together as shareholders in profitable concerns involving millions (such as the Lena Goldfields⁹⁶); Orthodox Christians and Jews, Russians and Germans, Poles and Ukrainians, everyone who possesses *capital*, exploit the workers of all nations in company.

Class-conscious workers stand for *full unity* among the workers of all nations in every educational, trade union, political, etc., workers' organisation. Let the Cadet gentlemen disgrace themselves by denying or belittling the importance of equal rights for Ukrainians. Let the bourgeoisie of all nations find comfort in lying phrases about national culture, national tasks, etc., etc.

The workers will not allow themselves to be disunited by sugary speeches about national culture, or "national-cultural autonomy". The workers of all nations together, concertedly, uphold full freedom and complete equality of rights in organisations common to all—and that is the guarantee of genuine culture.

The workers of the whole world are building up their own internationalist culture, which the champions of freedom and the enemies of oppression have for long been preparing. To the old world, the world of national oppression, national bickering, and national isolation the workers counterpose a new world, a world of the unity of the working people of all nations, a world in which there is no place for any privileges or for the slightest degree of oppression of man by man.

The Working Class and the National Question, Vol. 19, pp 91-92

The liquidators' conference in August 1912⁹⁷—as was admitted even by the neutral Menshevik Plekhanov—*contravened* the Programme of the R.S.D.L.P. in the spirit of "*adaptation of socialism to nationalism*".

In fact, this conference recognised, on the proposal of the Bund, the permissibility of the slogan of "cultural-national

autonomy", which was contrary to the decision taken by the Second Party Congress.

This slogan (defended in Russia by *all the bourgeois* Jewish nationalist parties) contradicts the *internationalism* of Social-Democracy. As democrats, we are irreconcilably hostile to any, however slight, oppression of any nationality and to any privileges for any nationality. As democrats, we demand the right of nations to self-determination *in the political sense* of that term (see the Programme of the R.S.D.L.P.), i.e., the right to secede. We demand unconditional *equality* for all nations in the state and the unconditional protection of the rights of every national minority. We demand broad self-government and autonomy for regions, which must be demarcated, among other terms of reference, in respect of nationality too.

All these demands are obligatory for every consistent democrat, to say nothing of a socialist.

Socialists, however, do not limit themselves to general-democratic demands. They *fight* all possible manifestations of *bourgeois nationalism*, crude or refined. "National-cultural autonomy" is a manifestation precisely of this type—it *joins* the proletarians and bourgeoisie of *one* nation and *keeps* the proletarians of *different* nations *apart*.

Social-Democrats have always stood and still stand for the *internationalist* point of view. While protecting the equality of all nationalities against the serf-owners and the police state we do not support "*national culture*" but *international culture*, which includes only part of each national culture—only the consistently democratic and socialist content of *each* national culture.

The slogan of "national-cultural autonomy" deceives the workers with the phantom of a cultural unity of nations, whereas in every nation today a landowners', bourgeois or petty-bourgeois "culture" predominates.

We are against national culture as one of the slogans of bourgeois nationalism. *We are in favour of the international culture of a fully democratic and socialist proletariat.*

The unity of the workers of *all* nationalities coupled with the fullest equality for the nationalities and the most consistently democratic state system—that is our slogan, and it is the slogan of international revolutionary Social-Democracy. This truly proletarian slogan will not create the

false phantom and illusion of "national" unity of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, while the slogan of "national-cultural autonomy" undoubtedly does create that phantom and does sow that illusion among the working people.

We, Latvian Social-Democrats, living in an area with a population that is very mixed nationally, we, who are in an environment consisting of representatives of the bourgeois nationalism of the Letts, Russians, Estonians, Germans, etc., see with particular clarity the bourgeois falsity of the slogan of "cultural-national autonomy". The slogan of the *unity* of all and every organisation of workers of *all* nationalities, tested in practice in our own Social-Democratic organisation, is particularly dear to us.

Reference is frequently made to Austria in justification of the slogan of "national-cultural autonomy". As far as this reference is concerned it must be remembered that: first, the point of view of the chief Austrian theoretician on the national question, Otto Bauer (in his book *The National Question and Social-Democracy*), has been recognised as an *exaggeration* of the national factor and a *terrible underestimation* of the international factor even by such a cautious writer as Karl Kautsky (see: K. Kautsky, *Nationalität und Internationalität*; it has been translated into Russian); secondly, in Russia *only* the Bund members, together with all Jewish bourgeois parties, have so far defended "cultural-national autonomy", whereas *neither* Bauer *nor* Kautsky *recognise* national autonomy for the Jews, and Kautsky (*op. cit.*) declares outright that the Jews of Eastern Europe (Galicia and Russia) are *a caste* and not a nation; thirdly, the Brünn national programme of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party (1899) *does not* fully recognise extra-territorial (personal) national autonomy and goes only as far as to demand the union of all national regions of one nationality throughout the state (Sec. 3 of the Brünn Programme); fourthly, even this programme, obviously a compromise (and unsatisfactory from the standpoint of internationalism), was *a complete fiasco* in Austria itself, because the compromise did not bring peace but led, instead, to the secession of the Czech separatists; fifthly, these Czech separatists, unanimously condemned at the Copenhagen Congress⁹⁸ by the entire International, declare the Bund type of separatism to be close to them (see: *Der čechoslawische Sozial-demokrat*, No. 3, organ of the separat-

ists, which may be obtained gratis from *Prague*. Praha, Hybernska 7); sixthly, Bauer himself demands the unity of Social-Democratic political organisations of various nationalities *in each locality*. Bauer himself considers the “national system” of the Austrian party, which has now led to a *complete* schism, to be unstable and contradictory.

In short, references to Austria speak *against* the Bund and not *in its favour*.

Unity from below, the complete unity and consolidation in each locality of Social-Democratic workers of all nationalities in all working-class organisations—that is our slogan. Down with the deceptive bourgeois, compromise slogan of “cultural-national autonomy”!

We are *against* federation in the structure of our Party, too; we are for the *unity* of local (and not only central) organisations of Social-Democrats of all nations.

The Congress must reject both the slogan of cultural-national autonomy and the principle of federation in the structure of the Party. The Latvian Social-Democrats, like the Polish Social-Democrats, like the Social-Democrats of the Caucasus throughout the period from 1898 to 1912 (for 14 whole years of Party history) must remain true to Social-Democratic internationalism.

*Draft Platform for the Fourth Congress of
Social-Democrats of the Latvian Area,
Vol. 19, pp 115-18*

5. Social-Democrats, in upholding a consistently democratic state system, demand unconditional equality for all nationalities and struggle against absolutely all privileges for one or several nationalities.

In particular, Social-Democrats reject a “state” language. It is particularly superfluous in Russia because more than seven-tenths of the population of Russia belong to related Slav nationalities who, given a free school and a free state, could easily achieve intercourse by virtue of the demands of the economic turnover without any “state” privileges for any one language.

Social-Democrats demand the abolition of the old administrative divisions of Russia established by the feudal landowners and the civil servants of the autocratic feudal state and their replacement by divisions based on the requirements of

present-day economic life and in accordance, as far as possible, with the national composition of the population.

All areas of the state that are distinguished by social peculiarities or by the national composition of the population, must enjoy wide self-government and autonomy, with institutions organised on the basis of universal, equal and secret voting.

6. Social-Democrats demand the promulgation of a law, operative throughout the state, protecting the rights of every national minority in no matter what part of the state. This law should declare inoperative any measure by means of which the national majority might attempt to establish privileges for itself or restrict the rights of a national minority (in the sphere of education, in the use of any specific language, in budget affairs, etc.), and forbid the implementation of any such measure by making it a punishable offence.

7...a) It is impermissible, from the standpoint of Social-Democracy, to issue the slogan of *national* culture either directly or indirectly. The slogan is incorrect because, already under capitalism, all economic, political and spiritual life is becoming more and more international. Socialism will make it completely international. International culture, which is now already being systematically created by the proletariat of all countries, does not absorb "national culture" (no matter of what national group) as a whole, but accepts from *each* national culture *exclusively* those of its elements that are consistently democratic and socialist....

10. The crudely militant and Black-Hundred-type nationalism of the tsarist monarchy, and also the revival of *bourgeois* nationalism—Great-Russian (Mr. Struve, *Russkaya Molva*,⁹⁹ the Progressists,¹⁰⁰ etc.), the Ukrainian, and Polish (the anti-Semitism of Narodowa "Demokracja"¹⁰¹), and Georgian and Armenian, etc.—all this makes it particularly urgent for Social-Democratic organisations in all parts of Russia to devote greater attention than before to the national question and to work out consistently Marxist decisions on this subject in the spirit of consistent internationalism and unity of proletarians of all nations.

Theses on the National Question,
Vol. 19, pp. 245-47, 250

...Marxists will never allow their heads to be turned by nationalist slogans whether they are Great-Russian, Polish, Jewish, Ukrainian or any other. Nor do Marxists ever forget the elementary duty of any democrat to struggle against any persecution of any nation for "separatism", the duty to fight for the recognition of the full and unqualified equality of nations, and their right to self-determination.

Cadets on the Question of the Ukraine,
Vol. 19, p. 267

The extreme expression of present-day nationalism is the scheme for the nationalisation of Jewish schools. The scheme emanated from the educational officer of Odessa district, and has been sympathetically considered by the Ministry of Public "Education". What does this nationalisation mean?

It means segregating the Jews into *special* Jewish schools (secondary schools). The doors of all other educational establishments—both private and state—are to be completely closed to the Jews. This "brilliant" plan is rounded off by the proposal to limit the number of pupils in the Jewish secondary schools to the notorious "quota"!

In all European countries such measures and laws against the Jews existed only in the dark centuries of the Middle Ages, with their Inquisition, the burning of heretics and similar delights. In Europe the Jews have long since been granted complete equality and are fusing more and more with the nations in whose midst they live.

The most harmful feature in our political life generally, and in the above scheme particularly, apart from the oppression and persecution of the Jews, is the striving to fan the flames of nationalism, to segregate the nationalities in the state one from another, to increase their estrangement, to separate their schools.

The interests of the working class—as well as the interests of political liberty generally—require, on the contrary, the fullest equality of all the nationalities in the state without exception, and the elimination of every kind of barrier between the nations, the bringing together of children of all nations in the same schools, etc. Only by casting off every savage and foolish national prejudice, only by uniting the workers of all nations into one association, can the working class become a force, offer resistance to capitalism, and achieve a serious improvement in its living conditions.

Look at the capitalists! They try to inflame national strife among the "common people", while they themselves manage their business affairs remarkably well—Russians, Ukrainians, Poles, Jews, and Germans together in one and the same corporation. Against the workers the capitalists of all nations and religions are united, but they strive to divide and weaken the workers by national strife!

This most harmful scheme for the nationalisation of the Jewish schools shows, incidentally, how mistaken is the plan for so-called "cultural-national autonomy", i.e., the idea of taking education out of the hands of the state and handing it over to each nation separately. It is not this we should strive for, but for the unity of the workers of all nations in the struggle against *all* nationalism, in the struggle for a truly democratic *common* school and for political liberty generally. The example of the advanced countries of the world—say, Switzerland in Western Europe or Finland in Eastern Europe—shows us that only consistently-democratic state institutions ensure the most peaceable and human (not bestial) coexistence of various nationalities, *without* the artificial and harmful separation of education according to nationalities.

The Nationalisation of Jewish Schools,
Vol. 19, pp. 307-08

LIBERALS AND DEMOCRATS ON THE LANGUAGE QUESTION

On several occasions the newspapers have mentioned the report of the Governor of the Caucasus, a report that is noteworthy, not for its Black-Hundred spirit but for its timid "liberalism". Among other things, the Governor objects to artificial Russification of non-Russian nationalities. Representatives of non-Russian nationalities in the Caucasus are *themselves* striving to teach their children Russian, as, for example, in the Armenian church schools, in which the teaching of Russian is not obligatory.

Russkoye Slovo (No. 198), one of the most widely circulating liberal newspapers in Russia, points to this fact and draws the correct conclusion that the hostility towards the Russian language in Russia "stems exclusively" from the "artificial"

(the right word would have been "forced") implanting of that language.

"There is no reason to worry about the fate of the Russian language. It will itself win recognition throughout Russia," says the newspaper. This is perfectly true, because the requirements of economic exchange will always compel the nationalities living in one state (as long as they wish to live together) to study the language of the majority. The more democratic the political system in Russia becomes, the more powerfully, rapidly and extensively capitalism will develop, the more urgently will the requirements of economic exchange impel various nationalities to study the language most convenient for general commercial relations.

The liberal newspaper, however, hastens to slap itself in the face and demonstrate its liberal inconsistency.

"Even those who oppose Russification," it says, "would hardly be likely to deny that in a country as huge as Russia there must be one single official language and that this language can be only Russian."

Logic turned inside out! Tiny Switzerland has not lost anything, but has gained from having not *one single* official language, but three—German, French and Italian. In Switzerland 70 per cent of the population are Germans (in Russia 43 per cent are Great Russians), 22 per cent French (in Russia 17 per cent are Ukrainians) and 7 per cent Italians (in Russia 6 per cent are Poles and 4.5 per cent Byelorussians). If Italians in Switzerland often speak French in the common parliament they do not do so because they are compelled by some savage police law (there are none such in Switzerland), but because the civilised citizens of a democratic state themselves prefer a language that is understood by a majority. The French language does not excite hatred in Italians because it is the language of a free civilised nation, a language that is not imposed by disgusting police measures.

Why should "huge" Russia, a much more varied and terribly backward country, *inhibit* her development by the retention of any kind of privilege for any one language? Should not the contrary be true, liberal gentlemen? Should not Russia, if she wants to overtake Europe, put an end to every kind of privilege as quickly as possible, as completely as possible and as vigorously as possible?

If all privileges disappear, if the imposition of any one

language ceases, all Slavs will easily and rapidly learn to understand each other and will not be frightened by the "horrible" thought that speeches in different languages will be heard in the common parliament. The requirements of economic exchange will themselves *decide* which language of the given country it is to the *advantage* of the majority to know in the interests of commercial relations. This decision will be all the firmer because it will be adopted voluntarily by a population of various nationalities, and its adoption will be the more rapid and extensive the more consistent the democracy and, as a consequence of this, the more rapid will be the development of capitalism.

The liberals approach the language question in the same way as they approach all political questions—like hypocritical hucksters, holding out one hand (openly) to democracy and the other (behind their backs) to the serf-owners and police. We are against privileges, shout the liberals, and under cover they haggle with the serf-owners for first one, then another, privilege.

Such is the nature of *all* liberal-bourgeois nationalism—not only Great-Russian (it is the worst of them all because of its violent character and its kinship with the Purishkeviches) but Polish, Jewish, Ukrainian, Georgian and every other nationalism. Under the slogan of "national culture" the bourgeoisie of *all* nations, both in Austria and in Russia, are *in fact* pursuing the policy of splitting the workers, emasculating democracy and haggling with the serf-owners over the sale of the people's rights and the people's liberty.

The slogan of working-class democracy is not "national culture" but the international culture of democracy and the world-wide working-class movement. Let the bourgeoisie deceive the people with various "positive" national programmes. The class-conscious worker will answer the bourgeoisie—there is only one solution to the national problem (insofar as it can, in general, be solved in the capitalist world, the world of profit, squabbling and exploitation), and that solution is consistent democracy.

The proof—Switzerland in Western Europe, a country with an old culture, and Finland in Eastern Europe, a country with a young culture.

The national programme of working-class democracy is: absolutely no privilege for any one nation or any one

language; the solution of the problem of the political self-determination of nations, that is, their separation as states by completely free, democratic methods; the promulgation of a law for the whole state by virtue of which any measure (Zemstvo, urban or communal, etc., etc.) introducing any privilege of any kind for one of the nations and militating against the equality of nations or the rights of a national minority, shall be declared illegal and ineffective, and any citizen of the state shall have the right to demand that such a measure be annulled as unconstitutional, and that those who attempt to put it into effect be punished.

* Working-class democracy counterposes to the nationalist wrangling of the various bourgeois parties over questions of language, etc., the demand for the unconditional unity and complete solidarity of workers of *all* nationalities in *all* working-class organisations—trade union, co-operative, consumers', educational and all others—in contradistinction to any kind of bourgeois nationalism. Only this type of unity and solidarity can uphold democracy and defend the interests of the workers against capital—which is already international and is becoming more so—and promote the development of mankind towards a new way of life that is alien to all privileges and all exploitation.

Vol 19 pp 354-57

PLANS FOR AN ESSAY ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION

1

*Introduction.*¹⁰² The urgency of the national question. The bellicosity of nationalist reaction. The national question with socialist parties

1 (A)

1. Medieval particularism. Dialects—*n+1*. The vernacular and Latin.
2. Economic and democratic demands of the national state.
3. Democratic centralism as a general type of “normal” state.
Centralism *versus* local government. The “national state”.

+theory $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \alpha - \varepsilon \\ (1)-(5) \end{array} \right.$

(B)

The demand for the self-determination of nations, its significance and necessity.

4. The general democratic and historically Russian.

(Theses § 1-2.)
(a)-(d)

5. Its meaning. Theses § 3-§ 4.

6. The example of Norway.

(C)

7. The equality of nations and national privileges.

8. A *state language*. Switzerland versus Russia.

9. Territorial or personal autonomy¹⁰³ The significance of territories.

10. Russia's national regions.

11. Cultural-national autonomy

(α) the slogan of national culture is wrong.

(β) it contradicts internationalism.

(γ) it draws one into the sphere of influence of bourgeois nationalism..

(δ) absolute and refined nationalism

(ε) distraction from democratic tasks

(ξ) heterogeneous social composition of nations.

(η) town and countryside.

(ν) cultural-national autonomy—clericalism

Brünn ¹⁰¹ and Stalin Ukrainians

(ι) artificial character ("Sejms").

(κ) does not save them.

(λ) national curias.

(μ) its aim—to "partition", but they must be united.

11 bis Brünn Programme: § 3.

Brünn Congress. *Collapse* of cultural-national autonomy.

11 *ter.* The Jews.

Reception. *Theses*, p. 13.

12. A state law and guarantees of the rights of minorities.
Theses § 6.

Right of prosecution for violation of the respective demand for abolition.

Medem's objections and an analysis of them.

D 13. Austria

Wimberg
Brünn
Quotations from O. Bauer
The Czechs and separatism
Collapse

14. Russia. Theses § 9 (p. 17).

15 August Conference of liquidators versus S.R. conference.

2

Three parts:

A) Nationality as a bourgeois-democratic postulate and slogan.

B) The demand for national self-determination as a right.

C) Cultural-national autonomy.

D) The Austrian and Russian S.D. programmes.

The Ukraine. Bachinsky

Ukrainianism and Struve.

The bourgeoisie divides.

The roots of the national struggle.

The struggle against Ukrainianism.

Judenfrage. K. Kautsky.

Norway.

Austria—the “sick man” *after* Turkey.

The artificial nature of Austria (1848)

The disintegration of Austria or a federation of democratic national states?

K. Kautsky versus Renner-Springer und O. Bauer.
The Slav national movement of the Balkans.

Asia and its democratic evolution. Turkey—Persia—China—India.

Cultural-national autonomy and clericalism (Brünn)

The heterogeneous social composition of different nations. Capitalism as a mill of nations. Town and countryside. Different national composition.

An irony of fate: nations with territory do *not* accept the extritorial autonomy of nations, but a nation without territory does not receive recognition *even* from convinced supporters of national autonomy.

Reception of “cultural-national autonomy” in Russia. The *European* bourgeois parties of Jewry and cultural-national autonomy.

Norway and its secession in 1905.

Switzerland and its “language” (respective *national*) customs.

Crankiness (the Provençal language in France and attempts to revive it). Idem with *Plattdeutsch* in Germany. De-nationalisation.

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23,
Fifth Russian Edition, pp. 444-48

Only the clericals and the bourgeoisie can speak of national culture in general. The working people can speak only of the international culture of the world working-class

movement. That is the only culture that means full, real, sincere equality of nations, the absence of national oppression and the implementation of democracy. Only the unity and solidarity of workers of all nations in *all* working-class organisations in the struggle against capital will lead to "the solution of the national problem".

How Does Bishop Nikon Defend the Ukrainians? Vol. 19, pp. 380-81

Dear Friend,

✂Your letter of November 15 gave me great pleasure. You must realise how highly one in my position appreciates the opinions of comrades in Russia, especially thoughtful people, who are thinking hard studying the subject. I was therefore particularly pleased to get your early reply. One feels less isolated when one receives letters like this. But poetry enough—let's get down to business.

1. You are *in favour* of an official language in Russia. It is "necessary; it has been and will be of great progressive importance". I disagree emphatically. I wrote about this long ago in *Pravda*, and so far have not been refuted. Your argument does not convince me in the least. Quite the reverse. The *Russian* language has undoubtedly been of progressive importance for the numerous small and backward nations. But surely you must realise that it *would have been* of much greater progressive importance had there been no compulsion. Is not an "official language" a stick that *drives people away* from the Russian language? Why will you not understand the *psychology* that is so important in the national question and which, if the slightest coercion is applied, besmirches, soils, nullifies the undoubtedly progressive importance of centralisation, large states and a uniform language? But the economy is still more important *than* psychology: in Russia we *already* have a *capitalist* economy, which makes the *Russian* language essential. But you have no faith in the power of the economy and want to prop it up with the crutches of the rotten police regime. Don't you see that in this way you are *crippling* the economy and hindering its development? Will not the collapse of the wretched police regime multiply tenfold (even a thousandfold) the number of voluntary associations for protecting and spreading the

Russian language? No, I absolutely disagree with you, and accuse you of *königlich-preussischer Sozialismus*¹⁰⁵!

To S.G. Shahumyan, December 6, 1913,
Vol. 19, pp. 499-500

It is true, my dear Bundist, that international culture is not non-national. Nobody said that it was. Nobody has proclaimed a "pure" culture, either Polish, Jewish, or Russian, etc., and your jumble of empty words is simply an attempt to distract the reader's attention and to obscure the issue with tinkling words.

The *elements* of democratic and socialist culture are present, if only in rudimentary form, in *every* national culture, since in *every* nation there are toiling and exploited masses, whose conditions of life inevitably give rise to the ideology of democracy and socialism. But *every* nation also possesses a bourgeois culture (and most nations a reactionary and clerical culture as well) in the form, not merely of "elements", but of the *dominant* culture. Therefore, the general "national culture" is the culture of the landlords, the clergy and the bourgeoisie. This fundamental and, for a Marxist, elementary truth, was kept in the background by the Bundist, who "drowned" it in his jumble of words, i.e., *instead of* revealing and clarifying the class gulf to the reader, he in fact obscured it. *In fact*, the Bundist acted like a bourgeois, whose every interest requires the spreading of a belief in a non-class national culture.

In advancing the slogan of "the international culture of democracy and of the world working-class movement", we take *from each* national culture *only* its democratic and socialist elements; we take them *only* and *absolutely* in opposition to the bourgeois culture and the bourgeois nationalism of *each* nation. No democrat, and certainly no Marxist, denies that all languages should have equal status, or that it is necessary to polemise with one's "native" bourgeoisie in one's native language and to advocate anti-clerical or anti-bourgeois ideas among one's "native" peasantry and petty-bourgeoisie. That goes without saying, but the Bundist uses these indisputable truths to obscure the point in dispute, i.e., the real issue....

Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism—these are the two irreconcilably hostile slogans that corres-

pond to the two great class camps throughout the capitalist world, and express the *two* policies (nay, the two world outlooks) in the national question.

Critical Remarks on the National Question. 2. "National Culture", Vol. 20, pp. 24-25, 26 .

The question of assimilation, i.e., of the shedding of national features, and absorption by another nation, strikingly illustrates the consequences of the nationalist vacillations of the Bundists and their fellow-thinkers.

Mr. Liebman, who faithfully conveys and repeats the stock arguments, or rather, tricks, of the Bundists, has qualified as "the *old assimilation story*" the demand for the unity and amalgamation of the workers of all nationalities in a given country in united workers' organisations (see the concluding part of the article in *Severnaya Pravda*¹⁰⁶).

"Consequently," says Mr. F. Liebman, commenting on the concluding part of the article in *Severnaya Pravda*, "if asked what nationality he belongs to, the worker must answer: I am a Social-Democrat."

Our Bundist considers this the acme of wit. As a matter of fact, he gives himself away completely by *such* witticisms and outcries about "assimilation", *levelled against* a consistently democratic and *Marxist* slogan.

Developing capitalism knows two historical tendencies in the national question. The first is the awakening of national life and national movements, the struggle against all national oppression, and the creation of national states. The second is the development and growing frequency of international intercourse in every form, the break-down of national barriers, the creation of the international unity of capital, of economic life in general, of politics, science, etc.

Both tendencies are a universal law of capitalism. The former predominates in the beginning of its development, the latter characterises a mature capitalism that is moving towards its transformation into socialist society. The Marxists' national programme takes both tendencies into account, and advocates, firstly, the equality of nations and languages and the impermissibility of all *privileges* in this respect (and also the right of nations to self-determination, with which we shall deal separately later); secondly, the principle of international-

ism and uncompromising struggle against contamination of the proletariat with bourgeois nationalism, even of the most refined kind.

The question arises: what does our Bundist mean when he cries out to heaven against "assimilation"? He *could not* have meant the oppression of nations, or the *privileges* enjoyed by a particular nation, because the word "assimilation" here does not fit at all, because all Marxists, individually, and as an official, united whole, have quite definitely and unambiguously condemned the slightest violence against and oppression and inequality of nations, and finally because this general Marxist idea, which the Bundist has attacked, is expressed in the *Severnaya Pravda* article in the most emphatic manner.

No, evasion is impossible here. In condemning "assimilation" Mr. Liebman had in mind, *not* violence, *not* inequality, and *not* privileges. Is there anything real left in the concept of assimilation, after all violence and all inequality have been eliminated?

Yes, there undoubtedly is. What is left is capitalism's world-historical tendency to break down national barriers, obliterate national distinctions, and to *assimilate* nations—a tendency which manifests itself more and more powerfully with every passing decade, and is one of the greatest driving forces transforming capitalism into socialism.

Whoever does not recognise and champion the equality of nations and languages, and does not fight against all national oppression or inequality, is not a Marxist; he is not even a democrat. That is beyond doubt. But it is also beyond doubt that the pseudo-Marxist who heaps abuse upon a Marxist of another nation for being an "assimilator" is simply a *nationalist philistine*. In this unhandsome category of people are all the Bundists and (as we shall shortly see) Ukrainian nationalist-socialists such as L. Yurkevich, Dontsov and Co....

There are two nations in every modern nation—we say to all nationalist-socialists. There are two national cultures in every national culture. There is the Great-Russian culture of the Purishkeviches, Guchkovs and Struves¹⁰⁷—but there is also the Great-Russian culture typified in the names of Chernyshevsky and Plekhanov. There are *the same two* cultures in the Ukraine as there are in Germany, in France,

in England, among the Jews, and so forth. If the majority of the Ukrainian workers are under the influence of Great-Russian culture, we also know definitely that the ideas of Great-Russian democracy and Social-Democracy operate parallel with the Great-Russian clerical and bourgeois culture. In fighting the latter kind of "culture", the Ukrainian *Marxist* will always bring the former into focus, and say to his workers: "We must snatch at, make use of, and develop to the utmost every opportunity for intercourse with the Great-Russian class-conscious workers, with their literature and with their range of ideas; the fundamental interests of *both* the Ukrainian and the Great-Russian working-class movements demand it."

If a Ukrainian Marxist allows himself to be swayed by his *quite legitimate and natural* hatred of the Great-Russian oppressors *to such a degree* that he transfers even a particle of this hatred, even if it be only estrangement, to the proletarian culture and proletarian cause of the Great-Russian workers, then such a Marxist will get bogged down in bourgeois nationalism. Similarly, the Great-Russian Marxist will be bogged down, not only in bourgeois, but also in Black-Hundred nationalism, if he loses sight, even for a moment, of the demand for complete equality for the Ukrainians, or of their *right* to form an independent state.

The Great-Russian and Ukrainian workers must work together, and, as long as they live in a single state, act in the closest organisational unity and concert, towards a common or international culture of the proletarian movement, displaying absolute tolerance in the question of the language in which propaganda is conducted, and in the purely local or purely national *details* of that propaganda. This is the imperative demand of Marxism. All advocacy of the segregation of the workers of one nation from those of another, all attacks upon Marxist "assimilation", or attempts, where the proletariat is concerned, to contrapose one national culture as a whole to another allegedly integral national culture, and so forth, is *bourgeois* nationalism, against which it is essential to wage a ruthless struggle.

Critical Remarks on the National Question 3. The Nationalist Bogey of "Assimilation", Vol. 20, pp. 27-28, 32-33

The question of the "national culture" slogan is of enormous importance to Marxists, not only because it determines the ideological content of all our propaganda and agitation on the national question, as distinct from bourgeois propaganda, but also because the entire programme of the much-discussed cultural-national autonomy is based on this slogan.

The main and fundamental flaw in this programme is that it aims at introducing the most refined, most absolute and most extreme nationalism. The gist of this programme is that every citizen registers as belonging to a particular nation, and every nation constitutes a legal entity with the right to impose compulsory taxation on its members, with national parliaments (Diets) and national secretaries of state (ministers).

Such an idea, applied to the national question, resembles Proudhon's idea, as applied to capitalism. Not abolishing capitalism and its basis—commodity production—but *purg- ing* that basis of abuses, of excrescences, and so forth; not abolishing exchange and exchange value, but, on the contrary, making it "constitutional", universal, absolute, "*fair*", and free of fluctuations, crises and abuses—such was Proudhon's idea.

Just as Proudhon was petty-bourgeois, and his theory converted exchange and commodity production into an absolute category and exalted them as the acme of perfection, so is the theory and programme of "cultural-national autonomy" petty-bourgeois, for it converts bourgeois nationalism into an absolute category, exalts it as the acme of perfection, and purges it of violence, injustice, etc.

Marxism cannot be reconciled with nationalism, be it even of the "most just", "purest", most refined and civilised brand. In place of all forms of nationalism Marxism advances internationalism, the amalgamation of all nations in the higher unity, a unity that is growing before our eyes with every mile of railway line that is built, with every international trust, and every workers' association that is formed (an association that is international in its economic activities as well as in its ideas and aims).

The principle of nationality is historically inevitable in bourgeois society and, taking this society into due account, the Marxist fully recognises the historical legitimacy of

national movements. But to prevent this recognition from becoming an apologia of nationalism, it must be strictly limited to what is progressive in such movements, in order that this recognition may not lead to bourgeois ideology obscuring proletarian consciousness.

The awakening of the masses from feudal lethargy, and their struggle against all national oppression, for the sovereignty of the people, of the nation, are progressive. Hence, it is the Marxist's *bounden* duty to stand for the most resolute and consistent democratism on all aspects of the national question. This task is largely a negative one. But this ~~is~~ the limit the proletariat can go to in supporting nationalism, for beyond that begins the "positive" activity of the *bourgeoisie* striving to *fortify* nationalism.

To throw off the feudal yoke, all national oppression, and all privileges enjoyed by any particular nation or language, is the imperative duty of the proletariat as a democratic force, and is certainly in the interests of the proletarian class struggle, which is obscured and retarded by bickering on the national question. But to go *beyond* these strictly limited and definite historical limits in helping bourgeois nationalism means betraying the proletariat and siding with the bourgeoisie. There is a border-line here, which is often very slight and which the Bundists and Ukrainian nationalist-socialists completely lose sight of.

Combat all national oppression? Yes, of course! Fight *for* any kind of national development, *for* "national culture" in general?—Of course not. The economic development of capitalist society presents us with examples of immature national movements all over the world, examples of the formation of big nations out of a number of small ones, or to the detriment of some of the small ones, and also examples of the assimilation of nations. The development of nationality in general is the principle of bourgeois nationalism; hence the exclusiveness of bourgeois nationalism, hence the endless national bickering. The proletariat, however, far from undertaking to uphold the national development of every nation, on the contrary, warns the masses against such illusions, stands for the fullest freedom of capitalist intercourse and welcomes every kind of assimilation of nations, except that which is founded on force or privilege.

Consolidating nationalism within a certain "justly" delimit-

ited sphere, "constitutionalising" nationalism, and securing the separation of all nations from one another by means of a special state institution—such is the ideological foundation and content of cultural-national autonomy. This idea is thoroughly bourgeois and thoroughly false. The proletariat cannot support any consecration of nationalism; on the contrary, it supports everything that helps to obliterate national distinctions and remove national barriers; it supports everything that makes the ties between nationalities closer and closer, or tends to merge nations. To act differently means siding with reactionary nationalist philistinism.

When, at their Congress in Brünn (in 1899), the Austrian Social-Democrats discussed the plan for cultural-national autonomy, practically no attention was paid to a theoretical appraisal of that plan. It is, however, noteworthy that the following two arguments were levelled against this programme: (1) it would tend to strengthen clericalism; (2) "its result would be the perpetuation of chauvinism, its introduction into every small community, into every small group" (p. 92 of the official report of the Brünn Congress, in German. A Russian translation was published by the Jewish nationalist party, the J.S.L.P.).

There can be no doubt that "national culture", in the ordinary sense of the term, i.e., schools, etc., is at present under the predominant influence of the clergy and the bourgeois chauvinists in all countries in the world. When the Bundists, in advocating "cultural-national" autonomy, say that the constituting of nations will keep the class struggle within them *clean* of all extraneous considerations, then that is manifest and ridiculous sophistry. It is primarily in the economic and political sphere that a serious class struggle is waged in any capitalist society. To separate the sphere of education *from this* is, firstly, absurdly utopian, because schools (like "national culture" in general) cannot be separated from economics and politics; secondly, it is the economic and political life of a capitalist country that *necessitates* at every step the smashing of the absurd and outmoded national barriers and prejudices, whereas separation of the school system and the like, would only perpetuate, intensify and strengthen "pure" clericalism and "pure" bourgeois chauvinism.

On the boards of joint-stock companies we find capitalists of different nations sitting together in complete harmony. At the factories workers of different nations work side by side. In any really serious and profound political issue sides are taken according to classes, not nations. Withdrawing school education and the like from state control and placing it under the control of the nations is in effect an attempt to *separate* from economics, which unites the nations, the most highly, so to speak, ideological sphere of social life, the sphere in which "pure" national culture or the national cultivation of clericalism and chauvinism has the freest play.

✎ In practice, the plan for "extra-territorial" or "cultural-national" autonomy could mean only one thing: *the division of educational affairs according to nationality*, i.e., the introduction of national curias in school affairs. Sufficient thought to the *real* significance of the famous Bund plan will enable one to realise how utterly reactionary it is even from the standpoint of democracy, let alone from that of the proletarian class struggle for socialism.

A single instance and a single scheme for the "nationalisation" of the school system will make this point abundantly clear. In the United States of America the division of the States into Northern and Southern holds to this day in all departments of life; the former possess the greatest traditions of freedom and of struggle against the slave-owners; the latter possess the greatest traditions of slave-ownership, survivals of persecution of the Negroes, who are economically oppressed and culturally backward (44 per cent of Negroes are illiterate, and 6 per cent of whites), and so forth. In the Northern States Negro children attend the same schools as white children do. In the South there are separate "national", or racial, whichever you please, schools for Negro children. I think that this is the sole instance of actual "nationalisation" of schools.

In Eastern Europe there exists a country where things like the Beilis case¹⁰⁸ are still possible, and Jews are condemned by the Purishkeviches to a condition worse than that of the Negroes. In that country a scheme for *nationalising Jewish schools* was recently mooted in the Ministry. Happily, this reactionary utopia is no more likely to be realised than the utopia of the Austrian petty bourgeoisie, who have despaired of achieving consistent democracy or of putting an end to

national bickering, and have invented for the nations school-education *compartments* to keep them from bickering *over the distribution* of schools ... but have "constituted" themselves for an *eternal* bickering of one "national culture" with another.

In Austria, the idea of cultural-national autonomy has remained largely a flight of literary fancy, which the Austrian Social-Democrats themselves have not taken seriously. In Russia, however, it has been incorporated in the programmes of all the Jewish bourgeois parties, and of several petty-bourgeois, opportunist elements in the different nations—for example, the Bundists, the liquidators in the Caucasus, and the conference of Russian national parties of the Left-Narodnik trend. (This conference, we will mention parenthetically, took place in 1907, its decision being adopted *with abstention* on the part of the Russian Socialist-Revolutionaries and the P.S.P., the Polish social-patriots. Abstention from voting is a method surprisingly characteristic of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and P.S.P., when they want to show their attitude towards a most important question of principle in the sphere of the national programme!)

In Austria it was Otto Bauer, the principal theoretician of "cultural-national autonomy", who devoted a special chapter of his book to prove that such a programme cannot possibly be proposed for the Jews. In Russia, however, it is precisely among the Jews that all the bourgeois parties—and the Bund which echoes them—have adopted this programme.* What does this go to show? It goes to show that history,

* That the Bundists often vehemently deny that *all* the Jewish bourgeois parties have accepted "cultural-national autonomy" is understandable. This fact only too glaringly exposes the actual role being played by the Bund. When Mr. Manin, a Bundist, tried, in *Luch*, to repeat his denial, he was fully exposed by N Skop (see *Prosveshcheniye*, No. 3). But when Mr. Iev Yurkevich, in *Dzvin*¹⁰⁹ (1913, Nos. 7-8, p. 92), quotes from *Prosveshcheniye* (No. 3, p. 78) N Skop's statement that "the Bundists together with all the Jewish bourgeois parties and groups have long been advocating cultural-national autonomy" and *distorts* this statement by *dropping* the word "Bundists", and *substituting* the words "national rights" for the words "cultural-national autonomy", one can only raise one's hands in amazement! Mr. Iev Yurkevich is not only a nationalist, not only an astonishing ignoramus in matters concerning the history of the Social-Democrats and their programme, but a *downright falsifier of quotations* for the benefit of the Bund. The affairs of the Bund and the Yurkeviches must be in a bad way indeed!

through the political practice of another state, has exposed the absurdity of Bauer's invention, in exactly the same way as the Russian Bernsteinians (Struve, Tugan-Baranovsky, Berdayev and Co.), through their rapid evolution from Marxism to liberalism, have exposed the real ideological content of the German Bernsteinism.

Neither the Austrian nor the Russian Social-Democrats have incorporated "cultural-national" autonomy in their programme. However, the Jewish bourgeois parties in a most backward country, and a number of petty-bourgeois, so-called socialist groups *have adopted* it in order to spread ideas of bourgeois nationalism among the working class in a refined form. This fact speaks for itself.

* * *

Since we have had to touch upon the Austrian programme on the national question, we must reassert a truth which is often distorted by the Bundists. At the Brünn Congress a *pure* programme of "cultural-national autonomy" was presented. This was the programme of the South-Slav Social-Democrats, § 2 of which reads: "Every nation living in Austria, irrespective of the territory occupied by its members, constitutes an autonomous group which manages all its national (language and cultural) affairs quite independently." This programme was supported, not only by Kristan but by the influential Ellenbogen. But it was withdrawn; not a single vote was cast for it. A *territorialist* programme was adopted, i.e., one that did *not* create *any* national groups "irrespective of the territory occupied by the members of the nation".

Clause 3 of the adopted programme reads: "The self-governing *regions* of one and the same nation shall jointly form a nationally united association, which shall manage its national affairs on an absolutely autonomous basis" (cf. *Prosveshcheniye*, 1913, No. 4, p. 28). Clearly, this compromise programme is wrong too. An example will illustrate this. The German colonists' community in Saratov Gubernia, plus the German working-class suburb of Riga or Lodz, plus the German housing estate near St. Petersburg, etc., would constitute a "nationally united association" of Germans in Russia. Obviously the Social-Democrats cannot *demand* such a thing or *enforce* such an association, although of course they

do not in the least deny *freedom* of every kind of association, including associations of any communities of any nationality in a given state. The segregation, by a law of the state, of Germans, etc., in different localities and of different classes in Russia into a single German-national association may be practised by anybody—priests, bourgeois or philistines, but not by Social-Democrats.

Critical Remarks on the National Question. 4. "Cultural-National Autonomy", Vol. 20, pp. 33-40

In Switzerland there are *three* official languages, but bills submitted to a referendum are printed in *five* languages, that is to say, in two Romansh dialects, in addition to the three official languages. According to the 1900 census, these two dialects are spoken by 38,651 out of the 3,315,443 inhabitants of Switzerland, i.e., by a little over *one per cent*. In the army, commissioned and non-commissioned officers "are given the fullest freedom to speak to the men in their native language". In the cantons of Graubünden and Wallis (each with a population of a little over a hundred thousand) both dialects enjoy complete equality.

The question is: should we advocate and support this, the living *experience* of an advanced country, or borrow from the Austrians *inventions* like "extra-territorial autonomy", which have not yet been tried out anywhere in the world (and not yet been adopted by the Austrians themselves)?

To advocate this invention is to advocate the division of school education according to nationality, and that is a downright harmful idea. The experience of Switzerland proves, however, that the greatest (relative) degree of national peace *can be, and has been, ensured in practice* where you have a consistent (again relative) democracy throughout the state....

Advocacy of complete equality of nations and languages distinguishes only the consistently democratic elements in each nation (i.e., only proletarians), and *unites* them, not according to nationality, but in a profound and earnest desire to improve the entire system of state. On the contrary, advocacy of "cultural-national autonomy", despite the pious wishes of individuals and groups, *divides the nations* and in fact draws the workers and the bourgeoisie of any one nation

closer together (the adoption of this "cultural-national autonomy" by all the Jewish bourgeois parties).

Critical Remarks on the National Question. 5. The Equality of Nations and the Rights of National Minorities, Vol. 20, pp. 41-42

It is ridiculous to talk about the conditions and demands of modern capitalism while at the same time taking not the "modern", not the "capitalist", but the medieval, feudal and official-bureaucratic administrative divisions of Russia, and in their crudest form at that (gubernias instead of uyezds). Plainly, there can be no question of any serious local reform in Russia until these divisions are abolished and superseded by a *really* "modern" division that really meets the requirements, *not* of the Treasury, *not* of the bureaucracy, *not* of routine *not* of the landlords, *not* of the priests, but of capitalism; and one of the modern requirements of capitalism is undoubtedly the greatest possible national uniformity of the population, for nationality and language identity are an important factor making for the complete conquest of the home market and for complete freedom of economic intercourse.

Critical Remarks on the National Question. 6. Centralisation and Autonomy, Vol. 20, p. 48

"CULTURAL-NATIONAL" AUTONOMY

The essence of the plan, or programme, of what is called "cultural-national" autonomy (or: "the establishment of institutions that will guarantee freedom of national development") is *separate schools for each nationality*.

The more often all avowed and tacit nationalists (including the Bundists) attempt to obscure this fact the more we must insist on it.

Every nation, irrespective of place of domicile of its individual members (irrespective of territory, hence the term "extra-territorial" autonomy), is a united officially recognised

association conducting national-cultural affairs. The most important of these affairs is education. The determination of the composition of the nations by allowing every citizen to register freely, irrespective of place of domicile, as belonging to any national association, ensures absolute precision and absolute consistency in segregating the schools according to nationality.

Is such a division, be it asked, permissible from the point of view of democracy in general, and from the point of view of the interests of the proletarian class struggle in particular?

A clear grasp of the essence of the "cultural-national autonomy" programme is sufficient to enable one to reply without hesitation—it is absolutely impermissible.

As long as different nations live in a single state they are bound to one another by millions and thousands of millions of economic, legal and social bonds. How can education be extricated from these bonds? Can it be "taken out of the jurisdiction" of the state, to quote the Bund formula, classical in its striking absurdity? If the various nations living in a single state are bound by economic ties, then any attempt to divide them permanently in "cultural" and particularly educational matters would be absurd and reactionary. On the contrary, efforts should be made to *unite* the nations in educational matters, so that the schools should be a preparation for what is actually done in real life. At the present time we see that the different nations are unequal in the rights they possess and in their level of development. Under these circumstances, segregating the schools according to nationality would *actually* and inevitably *worsen* the conditions of the more backward nations. In the Southern, former slave States of America, Negro children are still segregated in separate schools, whereas in the North, white and Negro children attend the same schools. In Russia a plan was recently proposed for the "nationalisation of Jewish schools", i.e., the segregation of Jewish children from the children of other nationalities in separate schools. It is needless to add that this plan originated in the most reactionary, Purishkevich circles.

One cannot be a democrat and at the same time advocate the principle of segregating the schools according to nationality. Note: we are arguing at present from the general-democratic (i.e., bourgeois-democratic) point of view.

From the point of view of the proletarian class struggle we must oppose segregating the schools according to nationality far more emphatically. Who does not know that the capitalists of all the nations in a given state are most closely and intimately united in joint-stock companies, cartels and trusts, in manufacturers' associations, etc., which are directed *against* the workers irrespective of their nationality? Who does not know that in *any* capitalist undertaking—from huge works, mines and factories and commercial enterprises down to capitalist farms—we *always*, without exception, see a larger variety of nationalities among the workers than in remote, peaceful and sleepy villages?

The urban workers, who are best acquainted with developed capitalism and perceive more profoundly the psychology of the class struggle—their whole life teaches them or they perhaps imbibe it with their mothers' milk—such workers instinctively and inevitably realise that segregating the schools according to nationality is not only a *harmful* scheme, but a downright fraudulent swindle *on the part of the capitalists*. The workers *can* be split up, divided and weakened by the advocacy of such an idea, and still more by the segregation of the ordinary peoples' schools according to nationality; while the capitalists, whose children are well provided with rich private schools and specially engaged tutors, cannot *in any way* be threatened by any division or weakening through "cultural-national autonomy".

As a matter of fact, "cultural-national autonomy", i.e., the absolutely pure and consistent segregating of education according to nationality, was invented not by the capitalists (*for the time being* they resort to cruder methods to divide the workers) but by the opportunist, philistine intelligentsia of Austria. There is *not a trace* of this brilliantly philistine and brilliantly nationalist idea in any of the democratic West-European countries with mixed populations. This idea of the despairing petty bourgeois could arise only in Eastern Europe, in backward, feudal, clerical, bureaucratic Austria, where *all* public and political life is hampered by wretched, petty squabbling (worse still: cursing and brawling) over the question of languages. Since cat and dog can't agree, let us at least segregate all the nations once and for all absolutely clearly and consistently in "national surias" for educational purposes! Such is the psychology that engendered this

foolish idea of "cultural-national autonomy". The proletariat, which is conscious of and cherishes its internationalism, will never accept this nonsense of refined nationalism.

It is no accident that in Russia this idea of "cultural-national autonomy" was accepted *only by all* the Jewish bourgeois parties, then (in 1907) by the conference of the *petty-bourgeois* Left-Narodnik parties of different nationalities, and lastly by the petty-bourgeois, opportunist elements of the *near-Marxist* groups, i.e., the Bundists and the liquidators (the latter were even too timid to do so straightforwardly and definitely). It is no accident that in the State Duma *only* the semi-liquidator Chkhenkeli, who is infected with nationalism, and the petty-bourgeois Kerensky, spoke in favour of "cultural-national autonomy".

In general, it is quite funny to read the liquidator and Bundist references to Austria on this question. First of all, why should the most backward of the multinational countries be taken as the *model*? Why not take the most advanced? This is very much in the style of the bad Russian liberals, the Cadets, who for models of a constitution turn mainly to such backward countries as Prussia and Austria, and not to advanced countries like France, Switzerland and America!

Secondly, after taking the Austrian model, the Russian nationalist philistines, i.e., the Bundists, liquidators, Left Narodniks; and so forth, have themselves changed it *for the worse*. In this country it is the Bundists (plus *all* the Jewish bourgeois parties, in whose wake the Bundists follow without always realising it) that mainly and primarily use this plan for "cultural-national autonomy" in their propaganda and agitation; and yet in Austria, the country where this idea of "cultural-national autonomy" originated, Otto Bauer, the father of the idea, devoted a special chapter of his book to proving that "cultural-national autonomy" *cannot* be applied to the Jews!

This proves more conclusively than lengthy speeches how inconsistent Otto Bauer is and how little he believes in his own idea, for he excludes the *only* extra-territorial (not having its own territory) nation from his plan for extra-territorial national autonomy.

This shows how Bundists borrow *old-fashioned* plans from Europe, multiply the mistakes of Europe tenfold and "develop" them to the point of absurdity.

The fact is—and this is the third point—that at their congress in Brünn (in 1899) the Austrian Social-Democrats *rejected* the programme of “cultural-national autonomy” that was proposed to them. They merely adopted a compromise in the form of a proposal for a union of the nationally delimited *regions* of the country. This compromise did *not* provide either for extra-territoriality or for segregating education according to nationality. In accordance with this compromise, in the most advanced (capitalistically) populated centres, towns, factory and mining districts, large country estates, etc., there are *no* separate schools for each nationality!

The Russian working class has been combating this reactionary, pernicious, petty-bourgeois nationalist idea of “cultural-national autonomy”, and will continue to do so.

Vol. 19, pp. 503-07

As is the practice, the census programme¹¹⁰ was repeatedly discussed throughout 1910 by a host of official cabinets and conferences, each of which did something to spoil it. As a result, for instance, there is only one head, “Russian Language”, on the question of the pupil’s mother tongue: it is clearly prohibited to make the subdivision into Byelorussian, Little Russian (Ukrainian) and Great Russian.

The Poverty of the People’s Teachers,
Vol. 41, p. 300

THE NATIONALITY OF PUPILS IN RUSSIAN SCHOOLS

To obtain a more precise idea of the plan for “cultural-national autonomy”, which boils down to segregating the schools according to nationality, it is useful to take the concrete data which show the nationality of the pupils attending Russian schools. For the St. Petersburg educational area such data are provided by the returns of the school census taken on January 18, 1911.

The following are the data on the distribution of pupils attending elementary schools under the Ministry of Public Education according to the *native languages* of the pupils. The data cover the whole of the St. Petersburg educational area, but *in brackets* we give the *figures for* the city of

St. Petersburg. Under the term "Russian language" the officials constantly lump together Great-Russian, Byelorussian and Ukrainian ("Little Russian", according to official terminology). Total pupils—265,660 (48,076).

Russian—232, 618 (44,233); Polish—1,737 (780); Czech—3 (2); Lithuanian—84 (35); Lettish—1,371 (113); Zhmud¹¹¹—1 (0); French—14 (13); Italian—4 (4); Rumanian—2 (2); German—2,408 (845); Swedish—228 (217); Norwegian—31 (0); Danish—1 (1); Dutch—1 (0); English—8 (7); Armenian—3 (3); Gipsy—4 (0); Jewish—1,196 (396); Georgian—2 (1); Ossetian—1 (0); Finnish—10,750 (874); Karelian—3,998 (2); Chud¹¹²—247 (0); Estonian—4,723 (536); Lapp¹¹³—9 (0); Zyryan¹¹⁴—6,008 (0); Samoyed¹¹⁵—5 (0); Tatar—63 (13); Persian—1 (1); Chinese—1 (1); not ascertained—138 (7).

These are comparatively accurate figures. They show that the national composition of the population is extremely mixed, although they apply to one of the basically Great-Russian districts of Russia. The extremely mixed national composition of the population of the large city of St. Petersburg is at once evident. This is no accident, but results from a *law* of capitalism that operates in all countries and in all parts of the world. Large cities, factory, metallurgical, railway and commercial and industrial centres generally, are certain, more than any other, to have very mixed populations, and it is precisely these centres that grow faster than all others and constantly attract larger and larger numbers of the inhabitants of the backward rural areas.

Now try to apply to these real-life data the lifeless utopia of the nationalist philistines called "cultural-national autonomy" or (in the language of the Bundists) "taking out of the jurisdiction of the state" questions of national culture, i.e., primarily educational affairs.

Educational affairs "shall be taken out of the jurisdiction of the state" and transferred to 23 (in St. Petersburg) "national associations" each developing "its own" "national culture"!

It would be ridiculous to waste words to prove the absurdity and reactionary nature of a "national programme" of this sort.

It is as clear as daylight that the advocacy of such a plan means, *in fact*, pursuing or supporting the ideas of bourgeois

nationalism, chauvinism and clericalism. The interests of democracy in general, and the interests of the working class in particular, demand the very opposite. We must strive to secure the *mixing* of the children of *all* nationalities in *uniform* schools in each locality; the workers of all nationalities must *jointly* pursue the proletarian educational policy which Samoilov, the deputy of the Vladimir workers, so ably formulated on behalf of the Russian Social-Democratic workers' group in the State Duma. We must most emphatically oppose segregating the schools according to nationality, no matter what form it may take.

✱ It is not our business to segregate the nations in matters of education in any way; on the contrary, we must strive to create the fundamental democratic conditions for the peaceful coexistence of the nations on the basis of equal rights. We must not champion "national culture", but expose the clerical and bourgeois character of this slogan in the name of the international culture of the world working-class movement.

But we may be asked whether it is possible to safeguard the interests of the *one* Georgian child among the 48,076 schoolchildren in St. Petersburg on the basis of equal rights. And we should reply that it is impossible to establish a special Georgian school in St. Petersburg on the basis of Georgian "national culture", and that to advocate such a plan means sowing *pernicious* ideas among the masses of the people.

But we shall not be defending anything harmful, or be striving after anything that is impossible, if we demand for this child free government premises for lectures on the Georgian language, Georgian history, etc., the provision of Georgian books from the Central Library for this child, a state contribution towards the fees of the Georgian teacher, and so forth. Under real democracy, when bureaucracy and "Peredonovism"¹¹⁶ are completely eliminated from the schools, the people can quite easily achieve this. But this real democracy can be achieved *only* when the workers of *all* nationalities are united.

To preach the establishment of special national schools for every "national culture" is reactionary. But under real democracy it is quite possible to ensure instruction in the native language, in native history, and so forth, *without* splitting up the schools according to nationality. And

complete local self-government will make it impossible for anything to be forced upon the people, as for example, upon the 713 Karelian children in Kem Uyezd (where there are only 514 Russian children) or upon the 681 Zyryan children in Pechora Uyezd (153 Russian), or upon the 267 Lettish children in Novgorod Uyezd (over 7,000 Russian), and so on and so forth.

Advocacy of impracticable cultural-national autonomy is an absurdity, which now already is only disuniting the workers ideologically. To advocate the amalgamation of the workers of all nationalities means facilitating the success of proletarian class solidarity, which will guarantee equal rights for, and maximum peaceful coexistence of, all nationalities.

Vol. 19, pp 531-33

The influence of petty-bourgeois, philistine nationalism has infected certain "would-be socialists", who advocate what is called "cultural-educational autonomy", i.e., the transfer of educational affairs (and matters of national culture in general) from the state to the individual nations. Naturally, Marxists combat this propaganda for the *segregation of nations*, they combat this refined nationalism, they combat *the segregating of the schools according to nationality*. When our Bundists, and later, the liquidators, wanted to support "cultural-national autonomy" *in direct opposition to our Programme*, they were condemned not only by the Bolsheviks, but also by the pro-Party Mensheviks¹¹⁷ (Plekhanov).

Now Mr. An, in *Novaya Rabochaya Gazeta* (No. 103), is trying to defend a bad case by subterfuge, and by showering abuse upon us. We calmly ignore the abuse; it is merely a sign of the liquidators' feebleness.

To have schools conducted in the native languages—this, Mr. An assures us, is what is meant by segregating the schools according to the nationalities of the pupils; the *Pravda*¹¹⁸ people, he says, want to deprive the non-Russians of their national schools!

We can afford to laugh at this trick of Mr. An's for everybody knows that *Pravda* stands for the fullest equality of languages, and even for the abolition of an official language! Mr. An's impotent rage is causing him to lose his head. This is dangerous, dear Mr. An!

The right of a nation to use its native language is explicitly and definitely recognised in §8 of the Marxist programme.

If Mr. An is right in stating that having schools conducted in the native languages means segregating the schools according to nationality, why did the Bundists in 1906, and the liquidators in 1912, "supplement" (or rather, *distort*) the Programme adopted in 1903—at the very Congress which *rejected* "cultural-national autonomy"—which *fully* recognises the right of a nation to use its *native language*?

Your subterfuge will fail, Mr. An, and you will not succeed in covering up with your noise, clamour and abuse the fact that the liquidators have *violated* this Programme, and that they have "adapted socialism to nationalism", as Comrade Plekhanov expressed it.

We do not want to have the Programme violated. We do not want socialism to be adapted to nationalism. We stand for complete democracy, for the complete freedom and equality of languages, but give no support whatever to the proposal to "transfer educational affairs to the nations" or to "segregate schools according to nationality".

"The question at issue is that of segregating the schools according to nations," writes Mr. An, "hence, these nations must exist in each locality, hindering each other's development; and consequently, *they must be segregated* in the sphere of public education as well."

The words we have emphasised clearly reveal how liquidationism is dragging Mr. An away from socialism towards nationalism. The *segregation* of nations within the limits of a single state is harmful, and we Marxists strive to *bring the nations together and to amalgamate them*. Our object is not to "segregate" nations, but to secure for them, through full democracy, an equality and coexistence as peaceful (relatively) as in Switzerland.*

*Once More on the Segregation of the
Schools According to Nationality.*
Vol. 19, pp. 549-50

...The question discussed was the *political* self-determination of nations, i.e., the right of nations to secede, whereas by "cultural self-determination" (a meaningless,

* Mr. An boldly asserts that "there is no intermixing of nations even in the cantons of Switzerland" Will he not blush if we mention *four* cantons: Berne, Fribourg, Graubünden and Valais?

pompous phrase, which contradicts the *entire* history of democracy) the liberals really mean only freedom of languages.

National-Liberalism and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination, Vol. 20, p. 56

IS A COMPULSORY OFFICIAL LANGUAGE NEEDED?

The liberals differ from the reactionaries in that they recognise the right to have instruction conducted in the native language, at least in the *elementary* schools. But they are completely at one with the reactionaries on the point that a compulsory official language is necessary.

What does a compulsory official language mean? In practice, it means that the language of the Great Russians, who are a *minority* of the population of Russia, is imposed upon all the rest of the population of Russia. In every school the teaching of the official language must be *obligatory*. All official correspondence must be conducted in the official language, not in the language of the local population.

On what grounds do the parties who advocate a compulsory official language justify its necessity?

The "arguments" of the Black Hundreds¹¹⁹ are curt, of course. They say: All non-Russians should be ruled with a rod of iron to keep them from "getting out of hand". Russia must be indivisible, and all the peoples must submit to Great-Russian rule, for it was the Great Russians who built up and united the land of Russia. Hence, the language of the ruling class must be the compulsory official language. The Purishkeviches would not mind having the "local lingoes" banned altogether, although they are spoken by about 60 per cent of Russia's total population.

The attitude of the liberals is much more "cultured" and "refined". They are for permitting the use of the native languages within certain limits (for example, in the elementary schools). At the same time they advocate an obligatory official language, which, they say, is necessary in the interests of "culture", in the interests of a "united" and "indivisible" Russia, and so forth.

"Statehood is the affirmation of cultural unity.... An official language is an essential constituent of state culture.... Statehood is based on unity of authority, the official language being an instrument of that unity. The official language possesses the same compulsory and universally coercive power as all other forms of statehood....

"If Russia is to remain united and indivisible, we must firmly insist on the political expediency of the Russian literary language."

This is the typical philosophy of a liberal on the necessity of an official language.

We have quoted the above passage from an article by Mr. S. Patrashkin in the liberal newspaper *Dyen* (No. 7). For quite understandable reasons, the Black-Hundred *Novoye Vremya* rewarded the author of these ideas with a resounding kiss. Mr. Patrashkin expresses "very sound ideas", Menshikov's newspaper stated¹²⁰ (No. 13588). Another paper the Black Hundreds are constantly praising for such very "sound" ideas is the national-liberal *Russkaya Mysl*. And how can they help praising them when the liberals, with the aid of "cultured" arguments, are advocating things that please the *Novoye Vremya* people so much?

Russian is a great and mighty language, the liberals tell us. Don't you want everybody who lives in the border regions of Russia to know this great and mighty language? Don't you see that the Russian language will enrich the literature of the non-Russians, put great treasures of culture within their reach, and so forth?

That is all true, gentlemen, we say in reply to the liberals. We know better than you do that the language of Turgenev, Tolstoy, Dobrolyubov and Chernyshevsky¹²¹ is a great and mighty one. We desire more than you do that the closest possible intercourse and fraternal unity should be established between the oppressed classes of all the nations that inhabit Russia, without any discrimination. And we, of course, are in favour of every inhabitant of Russia having the opportunity to learn the great Russian language.

What we do not want is the element of *coercion*. We do not want to have people driven into paradise with a cudgel; for no matter how many fine phrases about "culture" you may utter, a *compulsory* official language involves coercion, the use of the cudgel. We do not think that the great and mighty Russian language needs anyone having to study it by *sheer compulsion*. We are convinced that the development of capitalism in Russia, and the whole course of social life in

general, are tending to bring all nations closer together. Hundreds of thousands of people are moving from one end of Russia to another; the different national populations are intermingling; exclusiveness and national conservatism must disappear. People whose conditions of life and work make it necessary for them to know the Russian language will learn it without being forced to do so. But coercion (the cudgel) will have only one result: it will hinder the great and mighty Russian language from spreading to other national groups, and, most important of all, it will sharpen antagonism, cause friction in a million new forms, increase resentment, mutual misunderstanding, and so on.

Who wants that sort of thing? Not the Russian people, not the Russian democrats. They do not recognise national oppression *in any form*, even in "the interests of Russian culture and statehood".

That is why Russian Marxists say that there must be *no* compulsory official language, that the population must be provided with schools where teaching will be carried on in all the local languages, that a fundamental law must be introduced in the constitution declaring invalid all privileges of any one nation and all violations of the rights of national minorities.

Vol. 20, pp. 71-73

((English, or perhaps+Russian, may be a world language))¹²²

Theses for a Lecture on the National Question, Vol. 41, p. 316

...Both Norway and Sweden are countries that are far more civilised than Russia is—incidentally, *precisely because* they succeeded in applying in a democratic manner the formula of the "political self-determination" of nations. The breaking of *compulsory* ties *strengthened* voluntary economic ties, strengthened cultural intimacy, and mutual respect between these two nations, which are so close to each other in language and other things. The common interests, the closeness of the Swedish and Norwegian peoples actually *gained* from the secession, for secession meant the rupture of *compulsory* ties.¹²³

I hope that this example has made it clear that Kokoshkin and the Constitutional-Democratic Party take their stand entirely with the Ministry of the Interior when they try to scare us with the prospect of the "disintegration of the state" and urge us to be "careful in handling" an absolutely clear formula, which is accepted without question by the entire international democracy—the "political self-determination" of nationalities. We Social-Democrats are opposed to *all* nationalism and advocate democratic *centralism*. We are opposed to particularism, and are convinced that, *all other things being equal*, big states can solve the problems of economic progress and of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie far more effectively than small states can. But we value only voluntary ties, never compulsory ties. Wherever we see *compulsory* ties between nations we, while by no means insisting that every nation must secede, do *absolutely* and emphatically insist on the *right* of every nation to political self-determination, that is, to secession.

To insist upon, to advocate, and to recognise this *right* is to insist on the equality of nations, to refuse to recognise *compulsory* ties, to oppose all state privileges for any nation whatsoever, and to cultivate a spirit of complete class solidarity in the workers of the different nations.

The class solidarity of the workers of the different nations is strengthened by the substitution of voluntary ties for compulsory, feudalist and militarist ties.

We value most of all the equality of nations in popular liberties and for socialism....*

and insist on the privileges of the Great Russia. But we say: *no* privileges *for any* one nation, complete equality of nations and the unity, amalgamation of the workers of *all* nations.

Eighteen years ago, in 1896, the International Congress of Labour and Socialist Organisations in London adopted a resolution on the national question, which indicated the only correct way to work for both real "popular liberties" and socialism. The resolution reads:

"This Congress declares that it stands for the full right of all nations to self-determination, and expresses its sympathy for the workers of every

*The next two pages of this manuscript are missing.—Ed.

country now suffering under the yoke of military, national or other absolutism. This Congress calls upon the workers of all these countries to join the ranks of the class-conscious workers of the whole world in order jointly to fight for the defeat of international capitalism and for the achievement of the aims of international Social-Democracy."

And we, too, call for unity in the ranks of the workers of all nations in Russia, for only such unity can guarantee the equality of nations and popular liberties, and safeguard the interests of socialism.

The year 1905¹²⁴ united the workers of all nations in Russia. The reactionaries are trying to foment national enmity. The liberal bourgeoisie of *all* nations, first and foremost the Great-Russian bourgeoisie, is fighting for the privileges of *its own* nation (for example, the Polish kolo¹²⁵ is opposed to equal rights for Jews in Poland), is fighting for national segregation, for national exclusiveness, and is thereby *promoting* the policy of our Ministry of the Interior.

But true democracy, headed by the working class, holds aloft the banner of complete equality of nations and of unity of the workers of all nations in their class struggle. From this point of view we reject so-called "cultural-national autonomy", that is, the division of educational affairs in a given state according to nationality, or the proposal that education should be taken out of the hands of the state and transferred to separately organised national associations. A democratic state must grant autonomy to its various regions, especially to regions with mixed populations. This form of autonomy in no way contradicts democratic centralism; on the contrary, it is only through regional autonomy that genuine democratic centralism is *possible* in a large state with a mixed population. A democratic state is bound to grant *complete freedom* for the native languages and annul *all* privileges for any one language. A democratic state will not permit the oppression or the overriding of any one nationality by another, either in any particular region or in any branch of public affairs.

But to take education out of the hands of the state and to divide it according to nationality among separately organised national associations is harmful from the point of view of democracy, and still more harmful from the point of view of the proletariat. This would merely serve to perpetuate the segregation of nations, whereas we must strive to unite them. It would lead to the growth of chauvinism, whereas we must strive to unite the workers of all nations as closely as possible,

strive to unite them for a joint struggle against *all* chauvinism, against *all* national exclusiveness, against *all* nationalism. The workers of all nations have but one educational policy: freedom for the native language, and democratic and *secular* education.

On the Question of National Policy.
Vol. 20, pp. 222-24

Recognition of the equality of nations and languages is important to Marxists, not only because they are the most consistent democrats. The interests of proletarian solidarity and comradely unity in the workers' class struggle call for the **fullest* equality of nations with a view to removing every trace of national distrust, estrangement, suspicion and enmity. And full equality implies the repudiation of all privileges for any one language and the recognition of the *right* of self-determination for all nations.

To the bourgeoisie, however, the demand for national equality cry often amounts in practice to advocating national exclusiveness and chauvinism; they very often couple it with *advocacy* of the division and estrangement of nations. This is *absolutely* incompatible with proletarian *internationalism*, which advocates, not only *closer relations* between nations, but the *amalgamation* of the workers of all nationalities in a given state in *united* proletarian organisations. That is why Marxists emphatically condemn so-called "cultural-national autonomy", i.e., the idea that educational affairs should be *taken out* of the hands of the state and transferred to the *respective* nationalities. This plan means that in questions of "national culture" educational affairs are to be split up in *national associations* according to the nationalities in the given state federation, each with its own *separate* Diet, educational budgets, school boards, and educational institutions.

This is a plan of refined nationalism, which corrupts and divides the working class. To this plan (of the Bundists, liquidators and Narodniks, i.e., of the various petty-bourgeois groups), the Marxists contrapose the principle of complete equality of nations and languages and go to the extent of denying the necessity of an official language; at the same time they advocate the closest possible relations between the nations, uniform *state* institutions for all nations, uniform

school boards, a uniform education policy (secular education!) and the unity of the workers of the different nations in the struggle against the *nationalism of every national bourgeoisie*, a nationalism which is presented in the form of the slogan "national culture" for the purpose of deceiving simpletons.

Let the petty-bourgeois nationalists—the Bundists, the liquidators, the Narodniks and the writers for *Dzvin*—openly advocate their principle of refined bourgeois nationalism; that is their right. But they should not try to fool the workers, as Madam V. O. does, for example, in issue No. 35 of *Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta*, where she assures her readers that *Za Pravdu*¹²⁶ is *opposed* to instruction in schools being given in the native languages!

That is gross slander. The Pravdistis not only recognise this right, but are *more consistent* in recognising it than anyone else. The Pravdistis, who identified themselves with the conference of Marxists, which declared that *no compulsory official language was necessary*, were the *first* in Russia to recognise *fully* the right to use the native language!

It is crass ignorance to confuse instruction in the native language with "dividing educational affairs within a single state according to nationality", with "cultural-national autonomy", with "taking educational affairs out of the hands of the state".

Nowhere in the world are Marxists (or even democrats) opposed to instruction being conducted in the native language. And *nowhere in the world* have Marxists adopted the programme of "cultural-national autonomy"; Austria is the *only* country in which it *was proposed*.

The example of Finland, as quoted by Madam V. O., is an argument against herself, for in that country the *equality of nations and languages* (which we recognise unreservedly and more consistently than anybody) is recognised and carried out, but *there is no question there about taking educational affairs out of the hands of the state*, about separate national associations to deal with all educational affairs, about partitioning up the school system of a country with national barriers, and so forth.

...Throughout the world, the period of the final victory of capitalism over feudalism has been linked up with national movements. For the complete victory of commodity production, the bourgeoisie must capture the home market, and there must be politically united territories whose population speak a single language, with all obstacles to the development of that language and to its consolidation in literature eliminated. There is the economic foundation of national movements. Language is the most important means of human intercourse. Unity and unimpeded development of language are the most important conditions for genuinely free and extensive commerce on a scale commensurate with modern capitalism, for a free and broad grouping of the population in all its various classes and, lastly, for the establishment of a close connection between the market and each and every proprietor, big or little, and between seller and buyer.

Therefore, the tendency of every national movement is towards the formation of *national states*, under which these requirements of modern capitalism are best satisfied. The most profound economic factors drive towards this goal, and, therefore, for the whole of Western Europe, nay, for the entire civilised world, the national state is *typical* and normal for the capitalist period.

The Right of Nations to Self-Determination, Vol. 20, pp. 396-97

The categorical requirement of Marxist theory in investigating any social question is that it be examined within *definite* historical limits, and, if it refers to a particular country (e.g., the national programme for a given country), that account be taken of the specific features distinguishing that country from others in the same historical epoch.

What does this categorical requirement of Marxism imply in its application to the question under discussion?

First of all, it implies that a clear distinction must be drawn between the two periods of capitalism, which differ radically from each other as far as the national movement is concerned. On the one hand, there is the period of the collapse of feudalism and absolutism, the period of the formation of the bourgeois-democratic society and state, when the national movements for the first time become mass

movements and in one way or another draw *all* classes of the population into politics through the press, participation in representative institutions, etc. On the other hand, there is the period of fully formed capitalist states with a long-established constitutional regime and a highly developed antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—a period that may be called the eve of capitalism's downfall.

The typical features of the first period are: the awakening of national movements and the drawing of the peasants, the most numerous and the most sluggish section of the population, into these movements, in connection with the struggle for political liberty in general, and for the rights of the nation in particular. Typical features of the second period are: the absence of mass bourgeois-democratic movements and the fact that developed capitalism, in bringing closer together nations that have already been fully drawn into commercial intercourse, and causing them to intermingle to an increasing degree, brings the antagonism between internationally united capital and the international working-class movement into the forefront.

Of course, the two periods are not walled off from each other; they are connected by numerous transitional links, the various countries differing from each other in the rapidity of their national development, in the national make-up and distribution of their population, and so on. There can be no question of the Marxists of any country drawing up their national programme without taking into account all these general historical and concrete state conditions.

The Right of Nations to Self-Determination, Vol. 20, pp. 400-01

The geographic, economic and language ties between Norway and Sweden are as intimate as those between the Great Russians and many other Slav nations. But the union between Norway and Sweden was not a voluntary one, and in dragging in the question of "federation" Rosa Luxemburg was talking at random, simply because she did not know what to say. Norway was *ceded* to Sweden by the monarchs during the Napoleonic wars,¹²⁷ against the will of the Norwegians; and the Swedes had to bring troops into Norway to subdue her.

Despite the very extensive autonomy which Norway

enjoyed (she had her own parliament, etc.), there was constant friction between Norway and Sweden for many decades after the union, and the Norwegians strove hard to throw off the yoke of the Swedish aristocracy. At last, in August 1905, they succeeded: the Norwegian parliament resolved that the Swedish king was no longer king of Norway, and in the referendum held later among the Norwegian people, the overwhelming majority (about 200,000 as against a few hundred) voted for complete separation from Sweden. After a short period of indecision, the Swedes resigned themselves to the fact of secession.

3 This example shows us on what grounds cases of the secession of nations are practicable, and actually occur, under modern economic and political relationships, and the *form* secession sometimes assumes under conditions of political freedom and democracy.

No Social-Democrat will deny—unless he would profess indifference to questions of political freedom and democracy (in which case he is naturally no longer a Social-Democrat)—that this example *virtually* proves that it is the *bounden* duty of class-conscious workers to conduct systematic propaganda and prepare the ground for the settlement of conflicts that may arise over the secession of nations, not in the “Russian way”, but *only in the way* they were settled in 1905 between Norway and Sweden. This is exactly what is meant by the demand in the programme for the recognition of the right of nations to self-determination.

The Right of Nations to Self-Determination, Vol. 20, pp. 46-27

These wars¹²⁸ marked the destruction of feudalism, and were an expression of the struggle of the new, bourgeois society against feudal society. The national state was a necessary phase in the development of capitalism. The struggle for the self-determination of a nation, for its independence, for freedom to use its language, for popular representation, served this end—the creation of national states, that ground necessary at a certain stage of capitalism for the development of the productive forces.

Lecture on “The Proletariat and the War”, Vol. 36 p. 298

Is a sense of national pride alien to us, Great-Russian class-conscious proletarians? Certainly not! We love our language and our country, and we are doing our very utmost to raise *her* toiling masses (i.e., nine-tenths of *her* population) to the level of a democratic and socialist consciousness. To us it is most painful to see and feel the outrages, the oppression and the humiliation our fair country suffers at the hands of tsar's butchers, the nobles and the capitalists. We take pride in the resistance to these outrages put up from our midst, from the Great Russians; in *that* midst having produced Radishchev, the Decembrists¹²⁹ and the revolutionary commoners of the seventies¹³⁰; in the Great-Russian working class having created, in 1905, a mighty revolutionary party of the masses; and in the Great-Russian peasantry having begun to turn towards democracy and set about overthrowing the clergy and the landed proprietors.

On the National Pride of Great Russians,
Vol. 21, p. 103

The way in which the national question was posed at the end of the sixties of the past century may serve as an instructive example. The petty-bourgeois democrats, to whom any thought of the class struggle and of the socialist revolution was wholly alien, pictured to themselves a Utopia of peaceful competition among free and equal nations, under capitalism. In examining the immediate tasks of the social revolution, the Proudhonists totally "negated" the national question and the right of nations to self-determination. Marx ridiculed French Proudhonism and showed the affinity between it and French chauvinism. ("All Europe must and will sit quietly on their hindquarters until the gentlemen in France abolish 'poverty'.... By the negation of nationalities they appeared, quite unconsciously, to understand their absorption by the model French nation.") Marx demanded *the separation of Ireland* from Britain "although after the separation there may come federation", demanding it, not from the standpoint of the petty-bourgeois Utopia of a peaceful capitalism, or from considerations of "justice for Ireland", but from the standpoint of the interests of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat of the *oppressor, i.e., British nation* against capitalism. The freedom of *that* nation has been cramped and mutilated by the fact that it has

oppressed another nation. The *British* proletariat's internationalism would remain a hypocritical phrase if *they* did not demand the separation of Ireland. Never in favour of petty states, or the splitting up of states in general, or the principle of federation, Marx considered the separation of an oppressed nation to be a step towards federation, and consequently, not towards a split, but towards concentration, both political and economic, but concentration on the basis of democracy. As Parabellum sees it, Marx was probably waging an "illusory struggle" in demanding separation for Ireland. Actually, however, this demand *alone* presented a consistently revolutionary programme; it alone was in accord with internationalism; it alone advocated concentration along non-imperialist lines.

*The Revolutionary Proletariat and the
Right of Nations to Self-Determination,*
Vol. 21, p. 110

The aim of socialism is not only to end the division of mankind into tiny states and the isolation of nations in any form, it is not only to bring the nations closer together but to integrate them. And it is precisely in order to achieve this aim that we must, on the one hand, explain to the masses the reactionary nature of Renner and Otto Bauer's idea of so-called "cultural and national autonomy"¹³¹ and, on the other, demand the liberation of oppressed nations in a clearly and precisely formulated political programme that takes special account of the hypocrisy and cowardice of socialists in the oppressor nations, and not in general nebulous phrases, not in empty declamations and not by way of "relegating" the question until socialism has been achieved. In the same way as mankind can arrive at the abolition of classes only through a transition period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, it can arrive at the inevitable integration of nations only through a transition period of the complete emancipation of all oppressed nations, i.e., their freedom to secede.

*The Socialist Revolution and the Right of
Nations to Self-Determination,* Vol. 22,
p. 147

The position is different in Eastern Europe. As far as the Ukrainians and Byelorussians, for instance, are concerned,

only a Martian dreamer could deny that the national movement has not yet been consummated there, that the awakening of the masses to the full use of their mother tongue and literature (and this is an absolute condition and concomitant of the full development of capitalism, of the full penetration of exchange to the very last peasant family) is *still* going on there. The "fatherland" is historically not *yet* quite a dead letter there. There the "defence of the fatherland" can *still* be defence of democracy, of one's native language, of political liberty against oppressor nations, against medievalism, whereas the English, French, Germans and Italians lie when they speak of defending their fatherland in the present war, because actually what they are defending is *not* their native language, *not* their right to national development, but their rights as slave-holders, their colonies, the foreign "spheres of influence" of their finance capital, etc.

A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, Vol. 23, pp 39-40

All national oppression calls forth the resistance of the *broad masses* of the people; and the resistance of a nationally oppressed population always *tends* to national revolt. Not infrequently (notably in Austria and Russia) we find the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations *talking* of national revolt, while in practice it enters into reactionary compacts with the bourgeoisie of the oppressor nation behind the backs of, *and against*, its own people. In such cases the criticism of revolutionary Marxists should be directed not against the national movement, but against its degradation, vulgarisation, against the tendency to reduce it to a petty squabble. Incidentally, very many Austrian and Russian Social-Democrats overlook this and in their *legitimate* hatred of the petty, vulgar and sordid national squabbles—disputes and scuffles over the question, for instance, of which language shall have precedence in two-language street signs—refuse to support the national struggle....

A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, Vol. 23, p. 61

* We demand from our governments that they quit the colonies, or, to put it in precise political terms rather than in

agitational outcries—that they *grant* the colonies full *freedom* of secession, the genuine *right to self-determination*, and we ourselves are sure to implement this right, and grant this freedom, as soon as we capture power. We demand this from existing governments, and will *do* this when we are the government, *not* in order to “recommend” secession, but, on the contrary, in order to facilitate and accelerate the *democratic* association and merging of nations. We shall exert every effort to foster association and merger with the Mongolians, Persians, Indians, Egyptians. We believe it is our duty and *in our interest* to do this, for otherwise socialism in Europe will *not be secure*. We shall endeavour to render these nations, more backward and oppressed than we are, “disinterested cultural assistance”, to borrow the happy expression of the Polish Social-Democrats. In other words, we will help them pass to the use of machinery, to the lightening of labour, to democracy, to socialism.

If we demand freedom of secession for the Mongolians, Persians, Egyptians and *all* other oppressed and unequal nations without exception, we do so not because *we favour secession*, but *only* because we stand for *free, voluntary* association and merging as distinct from forcible association. That is the *only* reason!

A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, Vol 23, p 67

...The genuine Swiss Social-Democrats are striving to use Switzerland's relative freedom, her “international” position (proximity to the most cultured countries, the fact that Switzerland, thank God, does not have “a separate language of her own”, but uses three world languages) to extend, consolidate and strengthen the *revolutionary* alliance of the revolutionary elements of the proletariat of the whole of Europe....

The “Disarmament Slogan”, Vol 23, p. 103

8) The right of the population to receive instruction in their native tongue in schools to be established for the purpose at the expense of the state and local organs of self-government; the right of every citizen to use his native language at meetings; the native language to be used *on a*

level with the official language in all local public and state institutions; **the obligatory official language to be abolished.**

Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme, Vol. 24, p. 472

...You and your government,¹³² your new Ministers, actually continue the policy of annexations in regard to Finland and the Ukraine. You find fault with the Ukrainian congress and, through your Ministers, prohibit its sittings. Isn't that annexation? It amounts to a mockery of the rights of a nationality which was tormented by the tsars because its children wanted to speak their mother tongue....

Speech on War, June 9 (22), 1917, First All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, Vol. 25, p. 37

...No democrat can deny the Ukraine's right to freely secede from Russia. Only unqualified recognition of this right makes it possible to advocate a free union of the Ukrainians and the Great Russians, a *voluntary* association of the two peoples in one state. Only unqualified recognition of this right can actually break completely and irrevocably with the accursed tsarist past, when *everything* was done to bring about a *mutual estrangement* of the two peoples so close to each other in language, territory, character and history.

The Ukraine, Vol. 25, p. 91

...National oppression under the tsars, unmatched in savagery and absurdity, turned the rightless nationalities into great reservoirs of fierce hatred for the monarchs. It was not surprising that all Russians had been included in their hatred for those who went to the extent of prohibiting the use of the mother tongue, and doomed masses of people to illiteracy. It was assumed that the privileged Russians would try to retain the advantages which had been so assiduously preserved for them by Nicholas II and Kerensky.

Speech at the First All-Russian Congress of the Navy, Vol. 26, pp. 343-44

The policy of the R.C.P. on the national question, unlike the bourgeois-democratic declaration of the equality of

nations, which cannot be implemented under imperialism, is that of steadily drawing together and merging the proletarians and the working masses of all nations in their revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Among the working people of the nations that entered into the Russian Empire the mistrust of the Great Russians that has been inherited from the epoch of tsarist and bourgeois Great-Russian imperialism is rapidly vanishing, under the influence of their acquaintance with Soviet Russia, but that mistrust has not yet completely disappeared among all nations and among all sections of the working people. It is, therefore, necessary to exercise special caution in respect of national feelings and to ensure the pursuance of a policy of actual equality and freedom to secede so as to remove the grounds for this mistrust and achieve the close voluntary union of the Soviet republics of all nations. Aid to backward and weak nations must be increased by assisting the independent organisation and education of the workers and peasants of all nations in the struggle against medieval and bourgeois oppression and also by assisting in the development of the language and literature of nations that have been oppressed or have been underprivileged.

Draft Programme of the R.C.P (B.),
Vol. 29, p. 110

On the national question, the policy of the proletariat which has captured political power—unlike that of the bourgeois-democratic formal proclamation of equality of nations, which is impossible under imperialism—is persistently to bring about the real rapprochement and amalgamation of the workers and peasants of all nations in their revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. To achieve this object, the colonial and other nations which are oppressed, or whose rights are restricted, must be completely liberated and granted the right to secede as a guarantee that the sentiment inherited from capitalism, the distrust of the working people of the various nations and the wrath which the workers of the oppressed nations feel towards the workers of the oppressor nations, will be fully dispelled and replaced by a conscious and voluntary alliance. The workers of those nations which under capitalism were oppressor nations must take exceptional care not to hurt the

national sentiments of the oppressed nations (for example, the attitude of the Great Russians, Ukrainians and Poles towards the Jews, the attitude of the Tatars towards the Bashkirs, and so forth) and must not only promote the actual equality, but also the development of the language and literature of the working people of the formerly oppressed nations so as to remove all traces of distrust and alienation inherited from the epoch of capitalism.

Draft Programme of the R.C.P.(B.),
Vol. 29, p. 127

I have to say the same thing about the *national question*. Here too the wish is father to the thought with Comrade Bukharin. He says that we must not recognise the right of nations to self-determination. A nation means the bourgeoisie together with the proletariat. And are we, the proletarians, to recognise the right to self-determination of the despised bourgeoisie? That is absolutely incompatible! Pardon me, it is compatible with what actually exists. If you eliminate this, the result will be sheer fantasy. You refer to the process of differentiation which is taking place within the nations, the process of separation of the proletariat from the bourgeoisie. But let us see how this differentiation will proceed.

Take, for instance, Germany, the model of an advanced capitalist country whose organisation of capitalism, finance capitalism, was superior to that of America. She was inferior in many other respects, in technical development and production and in the political sphere, but in respect of the organisation of finance capitalism, in respect of the transformation of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism, Germany was superior to America. She is a model, it would seem. But what is taking place there? Has the German proletariat become differentiated from the bourgeoisie? No! It was reported that the majority of the workers are opposed to Scheidemann in only a few of the large towns. But how did this come about? It was owing to the alliance between the Spartacists¹³³ and the thrice-accursed German Menshevik-Independents,¹³⁴ who make a muddle of everything and want to wed the system of workers' councils to a Constituent Assembly! And this is what is taking place in that very Germany! And she, mark you, is an advanced country.

Comrade Bukharin says, "Why do we need the right of nations to self-determination?" I must repeat what I said opposing him in the summer of 1917, when he proposed to delete the minimum programme and to leave only the maximum programme.¹³⁵ I then retorted, "Don't halloo until you're out of the wood." When we have conquered power, and even then only after waiting a while, we shall do this. We have conquered power, we have awaited a while, and now I am willing to do it. We have gone directly into socialist construction, we have beaten off the first assault that threatened us—now it will be in place. The same applies to the right of nations to self-determination. "I want to recognise only the right of the working classes to self-determination," says Comrade Bukharin. That is to say, you want to recognise something that has not been achieved in a single country except Russia. That is ridiculous.

Look at Finland; she is a democratic country, more developed, more cultured than we are. In Finland a process of separation, of the differentiation of the proletariat is taking a specific course, far more painful than was the case with us. The Finns have experienced the dictatorship of Germany; they are now experiencing the dictatorship of the Allied powers.¹³⁶ But thanks to the fact that we have recognised the right of nations to self-determination, the process of differentiation has been facilitated there. I very well recall the scene when, at Smolny, I handed the act to Svinhufvud—which in Russian means "pighead"—the representative of the Finnish bourgeoisie, who played the part of a hangman. He amiably shook my hand, we exchanged compliments. How unpleasant that was! But it had to be done, because at that time the bourgeoisie were deceiving the people, were deceiving the working people by alleging that the Muscovites, the chauvinists, the Great Russians, wanted to crush the Finns. It had to be done.

Yesterday, was it not necessary to do the same thing in relation to the Bashkirian Republic? When Comrade Bukharin said, "We can recognise this right in some cases", I even wrote down that he had included in the list the Hottentots, the Bushmen and the Indians. Hearing this enumeration, I thought, how is it that Comrade Bukharin has forgotten a small trifle, the Bashkirs? There are no Bushmen in Russia, nor have I heard that the Hottentots have laid claim to an

autonomous republic, but we have Bashkirs, Kirghiz¹³⁷ and a number of other peoples, and to these we cannot deny recognition. We cannot deny it to a single one of the peoples living within the boundaries of the former Russian Empire. Let us even assume that the Bashkirs have overthrown the exploiters and we have helped them to do so. This is possible only when a revolution has fully matured, and it must be done cautiously, so as not to retard by one's interference that very process of the differentiation of the proletariat which we ought to expedite. What, then, can we do in relation to such peoples as the Kirghiz, the Uzbeks, the Tajiks, the Turkmen, who to this day are under the influence of their mullahs? Here, in Russia, the population, having had a long experience of the priests, helped us to overthrow them. But you know how badly the decree on civil marriage is still being put into effect. Can we approach these peoples and tell them that we shall overthrow their exploiters? We cannot do this, because they are entirely subordinated to their mullahs. In such cases we have to wait until the given nation develops, until the differentiation of the proletariat from the bourgeois elements, which is inevitable, has taken place.

Comrade Bukharin does not want to wait. He is possessed by impatience: "Why should we? When we have ourselves overthrown the bourgeoisie, proclaimed Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat, why should we act thus?" This has the effect of a rousing appeal, it contains an indication of our path, but if we were to proclaim only this in our programme, it would not be a programme, but a proclamation. We may proclaim Soviet power, and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and express the contempt for the bourgeoisie they deserve a thousand times over, but in the programme we must write just what actually exists with the greatest precision. And then our programme will be incontrovertible.

We hold a strictly class standpoint. What we are writing in the programme is a recognition of what has actually taken place since the time we wrote of the self-determination of nations in general. At that time there were still no proletarian republics. It was when they appeared, and only as they appeared, that we were able to write what is written here: "A federation of states organised after the *Soviet type*." The Soviet type is not yet Soviets as they exist in Russia, but

the Soviet type is becoming international. And this is all we can say. To go farther, one step farther, one hair's breadth farther, would be wrong, and therefore unsuitable for a programme.

We say that account must be taken of the stage reached by the given nation on its way from medievalism to bourgeois democracy, and from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy. That is absolutely correct. All nations have the right to self-determination—there is no need to speak specially of the Hottentots and the Bushmen. The vast majority, most likely nine-tenths of the population of the earth, perhaps 95 per cent, come under this description, since all countries are on the way from medievalism to bourgeois democracy or from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy. This is an absolutely inevitable course. More cannot be said, because it would be wrong, because it would not be what actually exists. To reject the self-determination of nations and insert the self-determination of the working people would be absolutely wrong, because this manner of settling the question does not reckon with the difficulties, with the zigzag course taken by differentiation within nations. In Germany it is not proceeding in the same way as in our country—in certain respects more rapidly, and in other respects in a slower and more sanguinary way. Not a single party in our country accepted so monstrous an idea as a combination of workers' councils and a Constituent Assembly. And yet we have to live side by side with these nations. Now Scheidemann's party is already saying that we want to conquer Germany. That is of course ridiculous, nonsensical. But the bourgeoisie have their own interests and their own press, which is shouting this to the whole world in hundreds of millions of copies, Wilson, too, is supporting this in his own interests. The Bolsheviki, they declare, have a large army, and they want, by means of conquest, to implant their Bolshevism in Germany. The best people in Germany—the Spartacists—told us that the German workers are being incited against the Communists; look, they are told, how bad things are with the Bolsheviki! And we cannot say that things with us are very good. And so our enemies in Germany influence the people with the argument that the proletarian revolution in Germany would result in the same disorders as in Russia. Our disorders are a

protracted illness. We are contending with desperate difficulties in creating the proletarian dictatorship in our country. As long as the bourgeoisie, or the petty bourgeoisie, or even part of the German workers, are under the influence of this bugbear—"the Bolsheviks want to establish their system by force"—so long will the formula "the self-determination of the working people" not help matters. We must arrange things so that the German traitor-socialists will not be able to say that the Bolsheviks are trying to impose their universal system, which, as it were, can be brought into Berlin on Red Army bayonets. And this is what may happen if the principle of the self-determination of nations is denied.

Our programme must not speak of the self-determination of the working people, because that would be wrong. It must speak of what actually exists. Since nations are at different stages on the road from medievalism to bourgeois democracy and from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy, this thesis of our programme is absolutely correct. With us there have been very many zigzags on this road. Every nation must obtain the right to self-determination, and that will make the self-determination of the working people easier. In Finland the process of separation of the proletariat from the bourgeoisie is remarkably clear, forceful and deep. At any rate, things will not proceed there as they do in our country. If we were to declare that we do not recognise any Finnish nation, but only the working people, that would be sheer nonsense. We cannot refuse to recognise what actually exists; it will itself compel us to recognise it. The demarcation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is proceeding in different countries in their own specific ways. Here we must act with utmost caution. We must be particularly cautious with regard to the various nations, for there is nothing worse than lack of confidence on the part of a nation. Self-determination of the proletariat is proceeding among the Poles. Here are the latest figures on the composition of the Warsaw Soviet of Workers' Deputies. Polish traitor-socialists—333, Communists—297. This shows that, according to our revolutionary calendar, October in that country is not very far off. It is somewhere about August or September 1917. But, firstly, no decree has yet been issued stating that all countries must live according to the Bolshevik revolutionary calendar; and even if it were issued, it would not be

observed. And, secondly, the situation at present is such that the majority of the Polish workers, who are more advanced than ours and more cultured, share the standpoint of social-defencism, social-patriotism. We must wait. We cannot speak here of the self-determination of the working people. We must carry on propaganda in behalf of this differentiation. This is what we are doing, but there is not the slightest shadow of doubt that we must recognise the self-determination of the Polish nation now. That is clear. The Polish proletarian movement is taking the same course as ours, towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, but not in the same way as in Russia. And there the workers are being intimidated by statements to the effect that the Muscovites, the Great Russians, who have always oppressed the Poles, want to carry their Great-Russian chauvinism into Poland in the guise of communism. Communism cannot be imposed by force. When I said to one of the best comrades among the Polish Communists, "You will do it in a different way", he replied, "No, we shall do the same thing, but better than you." To such an argument I had absolutely no objections. They must be given the opportunity of fulfilling a modest wish—to create a better Soviet power than ours. We cannot help reckoning with the fact that things there are proceeding in rather a peculiar way, and we cannot say: "Down with the right of nations to self-determination! We grant the right of self-determination only to the working people." This self-determination proceeds in a very complex and difficult way. It exists nowhere but in Russia, and, while foreseeing every stage of development in other countries, we must decree nothing from Moscow. That is why this proposal is unacceptable in principle.

Report on the Party Programme, March 19, 1919, Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), Vol. 29, pp. 170-75

I must now deal with the question of self-determination of nations. Our criticism has served to exaggerate the importance of this question. The defect in our criticism was that it attached special significance to this question, which, in substance, is of less than secondary importance in the programme's general structure, in the sum total of programme demands.

While Comrade Pyatakov was speaking I was amazed and asked myself what it was, a debate on the programme, or a dispute between two Organising Bureaus? When Comrade Pyatakov said that the Ukrainian Communists act in conformity with the instructions of the Central Committee of the R.C.P.(B.), I was not sure about the tone in which he said it. Was it regret? I do not suspect Comrade Pyatakov of that, but what he said was tantamount to asking what was the good of all this self-determination when we have a splendid Central Committee in Moscow. This is a childish point of view. The Ukraine was separated from Russia by exceptional circumstances, and the national movement did not take deep root there. Whatever there was of such a movement the Germans killed. This is a fact, but an exceptional fact. Even as regards the language it is not clear whether the Ukrainian language today is the language of the common people or not. The mass of working people of the other nations greatly distrusted the Great Russians whom they regarded as a kulak and oppressor nation. That is a fact. A Finnish representative told me that among the Finnish bourgeoisie, who hated the Great Russians, voices are to be heard saying: "The Germans proved to be more savage brutes, the Entente proved to be more savage, we had better have the Bolsheviks." This is the tremendous victory we have gained over the Finnish bourgeoisie in the national question. This does not in the least prevent us from fighting it as our class enemy and from choosing the proper methods for the purpose: The Soviet Republic, which has been established in the country where tsarism formerly oppressed Finland, must declare that it respects the right of nations to independence. We concluded a treaty with the short-lived Red Finnish Government and agreed to certain territorial concessions, to which I heard quite a number of utterly chauvinistic objections, such as: "There are excellent fisheries there, and you have surrendered them." These are the kind of objections which induce me to say, "Scratch some Communists and you will find Great-Russian chauvinists."

I think that the case of Finland, as well as of the Bashkirs, shows that in dealing with the national question one cannot argue that economic unity should be effected under all circumstances. Of course, it is necessary! But we must endeavour to secure it by propaganda, by agitation, by a

voluntary alliance. The Bashkirs distrust the Great Russians because the Great Russians are more cultured and have utilised their culture to rob the Bashkirs. That is why the term Great Russian is synonymous with the terms "oppressor", "rogue" to Bashkirs in those remote places. This must be taken into account, it must be combated, but it will be a lengthy process. It cannot be eliminated by a decree. We must be very cautious in this matter. Exceptional caution must be displayed by a nation like the Great Russians, who earned the bitter hatred of all the other nations; we have only just learned how to remedy the situation, and then, not entirely. For instance, at the Commissariat of Education, or connected with it, there are Communists, who say that our schools are uniform schools, and therefore don't dare to teach in any language but Russian! In my opinion, such a Communist is a Great-Russian chauvinist. Many of us harbour such sentiments and they must be combated.

That is why we must tell the other nations that we are out-and-out internationalists and are striving for the voluntary alliance of the workers and peasants of all nations.

*Concluding Speech, March 19, 1919,
Fifth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.),
Vol. 29, pp. 193-95*

(3) In view of the fact that Ukrainian culture (language, school, etc.) has been suppressed for centuries by Russian tsarism and the exploiting classes, the C.C., R.C.P. makes it incumbent upon all Party members to use every means to help remove all barriers in the way of the free development of the Ukrainian language and culture. Since the many centuries of oppression have given rise to nationalist tendencies among the backward sections of the population, R.C.P. members must exercise the greatest caution in respect of those tendencies and must oppose them with words of comradely explanation concerning the identity of interests of the working people of the Ukraine and Russia. R.C.P. members on Ukrainian territory must put into practice the right of the working people to study in the Ukrainian language and to speak their native language in all Soviet institutions; they must in every way counteract attempts at Russification that push the Ukrainian language into the background and must convert that language into an instru-

ment for the communist education of the working people. Steps must be taken immediately to ensure that in all Soviet institutions there are sufficient Ukrainian-speaking employees and that in future all employees are able to speak Ukrainian.

*Draft Resolution of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.)
on Soviet Rule in the Ukraine, Vol. 30,
pp. 163-64*

Stalin
Kharkov

February 22

It is essential immediately to arrange for interpreters at all headquarters and army institutions, and make it the duty of all to accept applications and other papers written in Ukrainian. This is absolutely essential—as far as language is concerned there must be every concession and the maximum of equality....

*Telegram to J. V. Stalin, February 22,
1920, Vol. 30, p. 373*

...As long as national and state distinctions exist among peoples and countries—and these will continue to exist for a very long time to come, even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a world-wide scale—the unity of the international tactics of the communist working-class movement in all countries demands, not the elimination of variety or the suppression of national distinctions (which is a pipe dream at present), but an application of the *fundamental* principles of communism (Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat), which will *correctly modify* these principles in certain *particulars*, correctly adapt and apply them to national and national-state distinctions. To seek out, investigate, predict, and grasp that which is nationally specific and nationally distinctive, in the *concrete manner* in which each country should tackle a *single* international task: victory over opportunism and Left doctrinairism within the working-class movement; the overthrow of the bourgeoisie; the establishment of a Soviet republic and a proletarian dictatorship—such is the basic task in the

historical period that all the advanced countries (and not they alone) are going through....

"Left-Wing" Communism—an Infantile Disorder, Vol. 31, p. 92

Fourthly, the strictest rules must be introduced on the use of the national language in the non-Russian republics of our union, and these rules must be checked with special care.¹³⁸

The Question of Nationalities or Autonomisation Vol. 36, p. 610

V. WORDS AND THEIR MEANING; REVEALING THE CONTENT OF CERTAIN CONCEPTS AND TERMS

...[Statistical Returns] do not include the so-called farmstead peasants, i.e., those community peasants who have left the community and have settled separately on purchased or rented land.

On the So-Called Market Question.
Vol. 1, p. 111

...When you compare the descriptions of peasant economy given by our radicals with precise first-hand data on rural economic life, you are astonished that there is no place in the criticised system of views for that mass of small hucksters who swarm in each of these markets, all these higglers and chafferers or whatever else the peasants call them in different localities, for all that mass of petty exploiters who dominate the markets and ruthlessly oppress the working people.

What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats.
Vol. 1, p. 235

...Some ten years ago there was a *hitch* in the affairs of the merchants and factory owners, what is called a crisis: goods were left on their hands; the factory owners suffered losses and began to increase fines with still greater energy.

Explanation of the Law on Fines Imposed on Factory Workers. Vol. 2, p. 36.

...Since this absolute rule is the main obstacle to the workers' fight for their emancipation, it naturally follows that it is in the direct interest of the workers to support every social movement against absolutism (absolute means unlimited; absolutism is the unlimited rule of the government).

Draft and Explanation of a Programme for the Social-Democratic Party. Vol. 2, p. 119

...We consider it useless to argue about the meaning of the word "handicraft," for, as we shall see later, *there is no form of industry* (except perhaps machine industry) which has not been included under this traditional term, a term that is absolutely useless for scientific investigation....

The Handicraft Census of 1894-95 in Perm Gubernia and General Problems of "Handicraft" Industry, Vol. 2, p. 361

...In outlook, Skaldin may be called a bourgeois enlightener. His views are very reminiscent of those of the eighteenth-century economists (correspondingly refracted, of course, in the prism of Russian conditions), and he reflected the general "enlightenment" character of the "heritage" of the sixties¹³⁹ quite vividly. Like the West-European enlighteners and the majority of the literary representatives of the sixties, Skaldin was imbued with a violent hostility to serfdom and *all its* economic, social and legal products. That was the first characteristic feature of the "enlightener." The second characteristic feature common to all the Russian enlighteners was ardent advocacy of education, self-government, liberty, European forms of life and all-round Europeanisation of Russia generally. And the third characteristic feature of the "enlightener" was his defence of the interests of the masses, chiefly of the peasants (who, in the days of the enlighteners, were not yet fully emancipated or only in process of being emancipated), the sincere belief that abolition of serfdom and its survivals would be followed by universal well-being, and a sincere desire to help bring this about. These three features constitute the essence of what in our country is called "the heritage of the sixties," and it is important to emphasise that *there is nothing whatsoever of Narodism in this heritage*....

The Heritage We Renounce, Vol. 2, p. 504-05

...But what else is the function of Social-Democracy if not to be a "spirit" that not only hovers over the spontaneous movement, but also *raises* this movement *to the level of its "programme"*? Surely, it is not its function to drag at the *tail* of the movement. At best, this would be of no service to the movement; at worst, it would be exceedingly harmful. *Rabocheye Dyelo*,¹⁴⁰ however, not only follows this "tactics-as-

process", but elevates it to a principle, so that it would be more correct to describe its tendency not as opportunism, but as *tail-ism* (from the word *tail*).

What Is to Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement, Vol. 5, p. 396

The German example recalled to my mind the German word "Verballhornung", which, literally translated, means "Ballhorning". Johann Ballhorn, a Leipzig publisher of the sixteenth century, published a child's reader in which, as was the custom, he introduced a drawing of a cock, but a cock without spurs and with a couple of eggs lying near it. On the cover he printed the legend, "*Revised* edition by Johann Ballhorn". Ever since then, the Germans describe any "revision" that is really a worsening as "Ballhorning".

What Is to Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement, Vol. 5, p. 410-11

...In *form* such a strong revolutionary organisation in an autocratic country¹⁴¹ may also be described as a "conspiratorial" organisation, because the French word "conspiracy" is the equivalent of the Russian word "zagovor" ("conspiracy"), and such an organisation must have the utmost secrecy.

What Is to Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement, Vol. 5, p. 475

Alas, alas! Again I have let slip that awful word "agents", which jars so much on the democratic ears of the Martynovs! I wonder why this word did not offend the heroes of the seventies¹⁴² and yet offends the amateurs of the nineties? I like the word, because it clearly and trenchantly indicates *the common cause* to which all the agents bend their thoughts and actions, and if I had to replace this word by another, the only word I might select would be the word "collaborator", if it did not suggest a certain bookishness and vagueness. The thing we need is a military organisation of agents.

What Is to Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement, Vol. 5, p. 515, footnote

We put the word "peasantry" in quotation marks in order to emphasise the existence in this case of an absolutely indubitable contradiction: in present-day society the peasantry of course no longer constitutes an integral class. But whoever is perplexed by this contradiction forgets that this is not a contradiction in exposition, in a doctrine, but a contradiction in life itself. This is not an invented, but a living and dialectical contradiction.

The Agrarian Programme of Russian Social-Democracy, Vol. 6, pp. 113-14

...Those who support the bourgeoisie make much ado about all sorts of co-operatives (societies for buying cheap and selling profitably)....

To the Rural Poor, Vol. 6, p. 390

The word "organisation" is commonly employed in two senses, a broad and a narrow one. In the narrow sense it signifies an individual nucleus of a collective of people with at least a minimum degree of coherent form. In the broad sense it signifies the sum of such nuclei united into a whole.

One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, Vol. 7, p. 257, footnote

..."The more widespread the title of Party member, the better," said Martov, without, however, explaining the benefit of a widespread *title* which did not correspond to fact¹⁴³....

One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, Vol. 7, p. 261

That comparisons are odious is an old axiom. In every comparison a likeness is drawn in regard to only one aspect or several aspects of the objects or notions compared, while the other aspects are tentatively and with reservation abstracted.

On Confronting Politics with Pedagogy, Vol. 8, p. 454

Abuse of terms is a most common practice in politics. The name "socialist", for example, has often been appropriated by supporters of English bourgeois liberalism ("We are all socialists now," said Harcourt), by supporters of Bismarck,

and by friends of Pope Leo XIII. The term "revolution" also fully lends itself to abuse, and, at a certain stage in the development of the movement, such abuse is inevitable. When Mr. Struve began to speak in the name of revolution we could not but recall Thiers. A few days before the February revolution this monstrous gnome, this most perfect embodiment of the bourgeoisie's political venality sensed that a storm was brewing among the people, and announced from the parliamentary tribune that he was *of the party of revolution!* (See Marx's *The Civil War in France*.) The political significance of *Osvobozhdeniye's* joining the party of revolution is *exactly the same* as Thiers's. When the Russian Thiers begin to speak of their belonging to the party of revolution, that means that the slogan of revolution has become inadequate, is meaningless, and defines no tasks since the revolution has become a fact, and the most diverse elements are going over to its side.

*Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the
Democratic Revolution, Vol. 9, pp. 127*

28

"Insurrection" is an important word. A call to insurrection is an extremely serious call. The more complex the social system, the better the organisation of state power, and the more perfected the military machine, the more impermissible is it to launch such a slogan without due thought. And we have stated repeatedly that the revolutionary Social-Democrats have long been preparing to launch it, but have launched it as a direct call only when there could be no doubt whatever of the gravity, widespread and deep roots of the revolutionary movement, no doubt of matters having literally come to a head. Important words must be used with circumspection. Enormous difficulties have to be faced in translating them into important deeds. It is precisely for that reason that it would be unpardonable to dismiss these difficulties with a mere phrase, to use Manilovist inventions to brush aside serious tasks or to put on one's eyes the blinkers of sweet dreams of so-called "natural transitions" to these difficult tasks.

A² revolutionary army are also important words. The creation of a revolutionary army is an arduous, complex, and lengthy process. But when we see that it has already begun

and is proceeding on all sides—though desultorily and by fits and starts—when we know that a genuine victory of the revolution is *impossible* without such an army, we must issue a definite and direct slogan, advocate it, make it the touchstone of the current political tasks.

The Latest in "Iskra" Tactics, or Mock Elections as a New Incentive to an Uprising, Vol. 9, pp. 367-68

I do not know the Russian equivalent of *tir* [Lenin uses the French word.—*Tr.*], by which I mean a place for target practice, where there is a supply of all kinds of fire-arms and where anyone may for a small fee practise shooting at a target with a revolver or rifle.

The Reorganisation of the Party, Vol. 10, p. 35

Religion must be declared a private affair. In these words socialists usually express their attitude towards religion. But the meaning of these words should be accurately defined to prevent any misunderstanding. We demand that religion be held a private affair so far as the state is concerned. But by no means can we consider religion a private affair so far as our Party is concerned. Religion must be of no concern to the state, and religious societies must have no connection with governmental authority. Everyone must be absolutely free to profess any religion he pleases, or no religion whatever, i.e., to be an atheist, which every socialist is, as a rule. Discrimination among citizens on account of their religious convictions is wholly intolerable.

Socialism and Religion, Vol. 10, p. 84

In the German press this party is often called the "labour group",¹¹¹ which seems to point to kinship with the working class. In actual fact there is not even this verbal relationship between them in Russian. It is, therefore, better to leave the word "Trudoviks" untranslated, using it to mean petty-bourgeois, specifically peasant, democrats.

The Elections to the Duma and the Tactics of the Russian Social-Democrats, Vol. 12, p. 198, footnote

But I will tell you that the whole history of landed proprietorship and landlord farming in Russia, all the data

on landlord farming prove that the "guidance" of the landlords has always meant and today still means the unbridled coercion of the peasants, the endless denigration of peasant men and women, the most unconscionable and shameless exploitation (that word means "plunder" in Russian) of peasant labour, exploitation never seen anywhere else in the world. Such oppression and abuse, such poverty as that endured by the Russian peasant, is not to be found, not only in Western Europe, but even in Turkey.

Draft for a Speech on the Agrarian Question in the Second State Duma,
Vol. 12, p. 269

The gubernia committees of landlords, in 1861,¹⁴⁵ and the landlords who were civil mediators¹⁴⁶ (apparently they were called "civil" because they were civil to the landlords) *emancipated* the peasants in such a way that *one-fifth* of the peasants' land was cut off by the landlords!

Draft for a Speech on the Agrarian Question in the Second State Duma,
Vol. 12, pp. 270-71

What do they complain of?¹⁴⁷ They complain that the Duma is "anaemic" (i.e., in plain Russian, bloodless and spineless).

An Anaemic Duma or an Anaemic Petty Bourgeoisie, Vol. 12, p. 337

...There we noted three principal types of bourgeois parties: the Octobrists,¹⁴⁸ the liberals¹⁴⁹ and the peasant democrats (at that time they were not yet fully delineated, and the word "Trudovik" did not exist in the Russian political vocabulary)....

Speech on the Attitude Towards Bourgeois Parties, May 12(25), 1907, The Fifth Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., Vol. 12, p. 459

And the circles, i.e., close-knit, exclusive groups uniting a very small number of people and nearly always based on personal friendship, were a necessary stage in the development of socialism and the workers' movement in Russia.

Preface to the Collection "Twelve Years",
Vol. 13, p. 105

...On the one hand, the remarkably powerful, forthright and sincere protest against social falsehood and hypocrisy; and on the other, the "Tolstoyan", i.e., the jaded, hysterical sniveller called the Russian intellectual, who publicly beats his breast and wails: "I am a bad wicked man, but I am practising moral self-perfection; I don't eat meat any more, I now eat rice cutlets."¹⁵⁰...

Leo Tolstoy as the Mirror of the Russian Revolution, Vol. 15, p. 205

To summarise: the word "experience", on which the Machists build their systems, has long served as a shield for idealist systems, and now serves Avenarius and Co. for eclectically passing from the idealist position to the materialist position and vice versa. The various "definitions" of this concept are only expressions of those two fundamental lines in philosophy which were so strikingly revealed by Engels.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Vol. 14, p. 151

We must here note that our Russian Machists with amazing naïveté replace the question of the materialist or idealist trend of all arguments on the law of casuality by the question of one or another formulation of this law. They believed the German empirio-critical professors that merely to say "functional correlation" was to make a discovery in "recent positivism" and to release one from the "fetishism" of expressions like "necessity", "law", and so forth. This of course is utterly absurd, and Wundt was fully justified in ridiculing such a *change of words* (in the article, quoted above, in *Philosophische Studien*, S. 383, 388), which in fact changes nothing.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Vol. 14, p. 159

...In France, those who put faith above reason are called fideists (from the Latin *fides*, faith). Anti-intellectualism is a doctrine that denies the rights or claims of reason. Hence, in its philosophical aspect, the essence of the "crisis in modern physics" is that the old physics regarded its theories as "real knowledge of the material world", i.e., a reflection of objective reality. The new trend in physics regards theories only as symbols, signs, and marks for practice, i.e., it denies

the existence of an objective reality independent of our mind and reflected by it. If Rey had used correct philosophical terminology, he would have said: the materialist theory of knowledge, instinctively accepted by the earlier physics, has been replaced by an idealist and agnostic theory of knowledge, which, against the wishes of the idealists and agnostics, has been taken advantage of by fideism.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol 14, pp. 256-57

...A section in a party is a group of *like-minded persons* formed for the purpose primarily of influencing the party in a definite direction, for the purpose of securing acceptance for their principles in the party in the purest possible form. For this, real *unanimity of opinion* is necessary.

Conference of the Extended Editorial Board of Proletary, Vol 15, p 430

...In a period of bourgeois revolution the proletarian party is bound to have a following of petty-bourgeois *fellow-travellers* (what is known as *Mitläufer* in German) who are least capable of digesting proletarian theory and tactics, least capable of holding their own in time of collapse, most likely to carry opportunism to its extreme.

The Liquidation of Liquidationism
Vol 15, p 455

...Therefore the first task of all Social-Democrats is to take the initiative in organising nuclei (a word excellently expressing the idea that the objective conditions call for the formation of small, very flexible groups, circles, and organisations); it is the task of *all* Social-Democrats, even where there are only two or three of them, to gain some "foothold", establish connections of one kind or another, and start work that is systematic even if very modest.

The Election Campaign and the Election Platform, Vol 17, p 279

...A large-scale industry is developing in Switzerland. The use of waterfalls and mountain rivers as direct sources of electric power is playing a big part in this. The power of

falling water, which replaces coal in industry, is often called 'white coal'

In Switzerland Vol 18 p 160

Demagogy means lavishing promises that cannot be fulfilled

Hou P B Axelrod Exposes the Liquidators Vol 18 p 175

In the first half of 1912 *all* the political parties in Russia began, and virtually *completed*, what is known as the pre-election *mobilisation* of the party forces. Mobilisation is a military term. It means putting the army in a state of readiness for action. Just as an army is put in a state of readiness before a war, the reserves being called up and arms and ammunition distributed, so, before an election, all parties sum up their work, reaffirm their decisions on party views and slogans, rally their forces and prepare to fight all the other parties.

The Results of Six Months Work Vol 18 p 197

This is indeed forgetting the class struggle. This is what constitutes the main principle of a liberal labour policy. It is through this sort of "logic" that the role of the working class is reduced from leadership of a genuine consistent, whole-hearted democratic movement to spade-work for the liberals.

The Political Line Vol 18 p 333

Utopia is a Greek word, composed on *ou*, not and *topos*, a place. It means a place which does not exist, a fantasy, invention or fairy-tale.

In politics utopia is a wish that can never come true—neither now nor afterwards, a wish that is not based on social forces and is not supported by the growth and development of political, class forces.

Two Utopias Vol 18 p 355

At the Second Congress of the R S D I P (August 1903), the Iskristis split: the *majority* stood for the principles and tactics of the old *Iskra*,¹⁵¹ while the *minority* turned to opportunism, and was backed by the one-time enemies of

Iskra, the Economists¹⁵² and the Bundists.¹⁵³ Hence the terms Bolshevism * and Menshevism * (Bolsheviks and Mensheviks).

On Bolshevism, Vol. 18, p. 485

At the evening sitting on April 2, the Octobrist L. G. Lyuts said, when objecting to the working-class deputies' demand for a discussion of the question asked about the Lena events:¹⁵⁴

"Two days from now will be the anniversary of the events on the Lena. Apparently the Social-Democrats are trying to *budirovat* the feelings of the workers in order to encourage excesses.."

The French word *bouder* rendered in Russian by *budirovat* means *to sulk*, *to pout*. Mr. Lyuts, apparently, derives *budirovat* from *budorazhit* (excite) or, perhaps, *vozbudit* (incite). How the bourgeois deputies and the bourgeois press laughed when a peasant in the First Duma used the foreign word "prerogatives" in the sense of barriers ("*rogatki*" in Russ.—*Ed.*)! The mistake was all the more pardonable since various prerogatives enjoyed by the ruling classes are actually barriers in Russian life. Mr. Lyuts' educational attainments, however, did not "*vozbudirovat*" the laughter of his educated friends or their press.

Educated Deputies, Vol. 19, p. 52

Liquidationism is "an attempt on the part of a group of Party intellectuals to *liquidate* [i.e., dissolve, destroy, abolish, close down] the existing organisation of the Party and to replace it at all costs, even at the price of *downright renunciation of the programme, tactics, and traditions* of the Party [i.e., past experience], by a loose association functioning legally [i.e., in conformity with the law, existing "openly"]".

Controversial Issues. An Open Party and the Marxists, Vol. 19, pp. 150-51

...And so after the revolution the idea arose in the opportunist wing of our Party of renouncing the illegal Party, of *liquidating* it (hence the name "liquidators") and of *substituting* for it a legal ("open") party.

To Camille Huysmans, Vol. 20, p. 71

From the Russian words for *majority* and *minority*.—*Ed.*

But look at Plekhanov's new *volte-face*.¹⁵⁵ In the newspaper *Yedinstvo* he now denounces the Pravdists¹⁵⁶ for their "factionalism" and "usurpation", and asserts that we have "not one working-class press but two."

Plekhanov, Who Knows Not What He Wants, Vol. 20, p. 309

Indeed, if such "Social-Democrats" wish to be in the majority and to form the official "International" (=an alliance for international justification of national chauvinism), then is it not better to give up the name of "Social-Democrats", which has been besmirched and degraded by them, and return to the old Marxist name of Communists? Kautsky once threatened to do that when the opportunist Bernsteinians seemed to be close to conquering the German party officially. What was an idle threat from his lips will perhaps become *action* to others.

A German Voice on the War, Vol. 21, p. 93

The word Südekum has come to be used in a generic sense to denote a type of smug and unscrupulous opportunist and social-chauvinist

The Russian Brand of Südekum, Vol. 21, p. 118

on the
question
of
the word
energy

Incidentally, on p. 78 Feuerbach uses the expression: Energie d.h. Thätigkeit.* This is worth noting. There is, indeed, a subjective moment in the concept of energy which is absent, for example, in the concept of movement. Or, more correctly, in the concept or usage in speech of the concept of energy there is something that excludes objectivity. The energy of the moon (cf.) versus the movement of the moon.

Philosophical Notebooks Conspectus of Feuerbach's Book *Lectures on the Essence of Religion*, Vol. 38, p. 66

energy, i.e., activity.—*Ed.*

The term "putsch", in its scientific sense, may be employed only when the attempt at insurrection has revealed nothing but a circle of conspirators or stupid maniacs, and has aroused no sympathy among the masses.

*The Discussion on Self-Determination
Summed Up*, Vol. 22, p. 355

Instead of "Social-Democracy", whose official leaders *throughout* the world have betrayed socialism and deserted to the bourgeoisie (the "defencists" and the vacillating "Kautskyites"), we must call ourselves the *Communist Party*.

*The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present
Revolution*, Vol. 24, p. 24, footnote

...The resolution on the war adopted by the All-Russia Soviet of Peasants' Deputies. In keeping with the notorious—and no less muddled—appeal to the nations of the world (dated March 14), this resolution demands:

"peace without annexations and indemnities, with the right of every nation, in whatever state boundaries it may be living, to decide its own destiny."

The question of annexations is formulated differently here compared with the way it was recently put in *Izvestia* of the Petrograd Soviet and in *Dyelo Naroda* (see *Pravda* No. 60 for May 18).

The two latter newspapers,¹⁵⁷ controlled by the Narodnik-Menshevik bloc, are in a hopeless muddle when they declare that peace "without annexations" means returning to the state of things that existed before the war (the Latin phrase used for this is *status quo' ante bellum*).

Such a solution of the problem—let us not blink the truth—means making a deal with the capitalists and between the capitalists. It means: Let us keep the old annexations (made before the war), but let us have no new ones.

For one thing, no socialist who does not wish to betray socialism can accept such a solution. It is not a socialist's job to make peace between the capitalists on the basis of the old division of spoils, that is, annexations. That is obvious. Secondly, such a solution, in any event, is impracticable unless there is a revolution *against capital*, at least against Anglo-Japanese capital, since no man in his right senses can

doubt that *without a revolution* Japan will never give up Kiaochow, nor Britain Baghdad and her African colonies.

The peasant resolution gives a *different* definition to annexations. It proclaims the right of *every* nation (meaning also those annexed *before* the war) to be free and "to decide its own destiny".

This is the only correct solution of the problem as far as any really consistent democrat, not to mention a socialist, is concerned. No true socialist can put the question of annexations in any other way or deny *any* nation the right to self-determination and secession.

*A Deal with the Capitalists on Overthrow
of the Capitalists?*, Vol. 24, pp. 516-17

Here, it appears, there is too much "propaganda". "To win popularity" something that has no place there is injected into the programme.¹⁵⁸ In newspaper articles, in speeches, in popular pamphlets, "propaganda" is indispensable; the programme of a party, however, must be distinguished by the precision of its economics; it must contain nothing superfluous.

Revision of the Party Programme,
Vol. 26, p. 164-65

"We are now 'conquering' Finland—this is using a nasty word—but not the way the robber barons of international capitalism conquered it. We are winning Finland over by giving her complete freedom to live in alliance with us or with others, guaranteeing full support for the working people of all nationalities against the bourgeoisie of all countries.

*Speech at the First All-Russian Congress of
the Navy*, Vol. 26, p. 344

...The Central Committee proposes to you that the name of our Party be changed to the Russian Communist Party, with the word "Bolsheviks" added to it in brackets. We all recognise the necessity for this addition because the word "Bolshevik" has not only acquired rights of citizenship in the political life of Russia but also throughout the entire foreign press, which in general way keeps track of events in Russia. It has already been explained in our press that the name

“Social-Democratic Party” is scientifically incorrect....

Report on the Review of the Programme and on Changing the Name of the Party, March 8, 1918, Extraordinary Seventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), Vol. 27, p. 126

Finally I come to the chief objections that have been showered upon my article and my speech¹⁵⁹ from all sides. Particularly heavy fire was directed at the slogan: “steal back the stolen”, a slogan in which, no matter how I look at it, I can find nothing wrong, when history comes on the scene. If we use the words “expropriate the expropriators” why can’t we do without Latin words?

Reply to the Debate on the Report on the Immediate Tasks, Session of the All-Russia C.E.C., Vol. 27, p. 307

Let us point out, in passing, that when calling the non-Bolsheviks in Russia, i.e., the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, socialists, Kautsky was guided by their *name*, that is, by a word, and not by the *actual place* they occupy in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. What a wonderful understanding and application of Marxism!

The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, Vol. 28, p. 232

Bolshevism has popularised throughout the world the idea of the “dictatorship of the proletariat”, has translated these words from the Latin, first into Russian, and then into *all* the languages of the world, and has shown by the example of *Soviet government* that the workers and poor peasants, *even* of a backward country, even with the least experience, education and habits of organisation, *have been able* for a whole year, amidst gigantic difficulties and amidst a struggle against the exploiters (who were supported by the bourgeoisie of the *whole* world), to maintain the power of the working people, to create a democracy that is immeasurably higher and broader than all previous democracies in the world, and to *start* the creative work of tens of millions of workers and peasants for the practical construction of socialism.

The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, Vol. 28, p. 293

The people are aware of the greatness and significance of the struggle now going on. All that is needed is to find the practical form to enable the proletariat to establish its rule. Such a form is the Soviet system with the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dictatorship of the proletariat—until now these words were Latin to the masses. Thanks to the spread of the Soviets throughout the world this Latin has been translated into all modern languages; a practical form of dictatorship has been found by the working people. The mass of workers now understand it thanks to Soviet power in Russia, thanks to the Spartacus League in Germany and to similar organisations in other countries, such as, for example, the Shop Stewards Committees in Britain.¹⁶⁰ All this shows that a revolutionary form of the dictatorship of the proletariat has been found, that the proletariat is now able to exercise its rule.

Speech at the Opening Session of the First Congress of the Communist International, Vol. 28, p. 455-56

We have succeeded in making the word 'Soviet' intelligible in all languages. The masses have realised that their salvation lies in a workers' and peasants' government, in Soviets.

Speech Delivered at a Meeting in the People's House, Petrograd, March 13, 1919, Vol. 29, p. 53

...The word "freedom" is a good word. We meet it at every step: freedom to trade, freedom to sell, freedom to sell oneself, and so forth. And there are Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, rascals, who garble and distort this beautiful word "freedom" in every newspaper and in every speech. But these are all crooks, capitalism's prostitutes, who are trying to drag the people back to the past.

The Achievements and Difficulties of the Soviet Government, Vol. 29, p. 80

...Take, for instance, the collapse of transport, which we are experiencing so well, or rather so badly, in our own case. This same thing is taking place in other countries, too, even in the victor countries.¹⁶¹ And what does the collapse of transport mean under the imperialist system? A return to the most primitive forms of commodity production. We know very well what our profiteers or bagmen¹⁶² are. This latter

word, I think, has up to now been unknown to foreigners. And now? Speak to the comrades who have arrived for the Congress of the Third International. It turns out that similar words are beginning to appear in both Germany and Switzerland. And this is a category you cannot fit into any dictatorship of the proletariat; you have to return to the very dawn of capitalist society and commodity production.

Report on the Party Programme, March 19, Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B), Vol. 29, p. 167

In this country, in Russia, for the first time in the world history, the government of the country is so organised that only the workers and the working peasants, to the exclusion of the exploiters, constitute those mass organisations known as Soviets, and these Soviets wield all state power. That is why, in spite of the slander that the representatives of the bourgeoisie in all countries spread about Russia, the word "Soviet" has now become not only intelligible but popular all over the world, has become the favourite word of the workers, and of all working people.

What is Soviet Power?, Vol. 29, p. 248

We are marching into battle—this is the meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Gone is the time of naïve, utopian, fantastic, mechanical and intellectual socialism, when people imagined that it was sufficient to convince the majority, that it was sufficient to paint a beautiful picture of socialist society to persuade the majority to adopt socialism. Gone, too, is the time when it was possible to entertain oneself and others with these children's fairy-tales. Marxism, which recognises the necessity for the class struggle, asserts that mankind can reach the goal of socialism only through the dictatorship of the proletariat. The word dictatorship is a cruel, stern, bloody and painful one; it is not a word to play with. Socialists advance this slogan because they know that the exploiters will surrender only after a desperate and relentless struggle, and that they will try to cover up their own rule by means of all sorts of high-sounding words.

Deception of the People with Slogans of Freedom and Equality, May 19, 1919, First All-Russia Congress on Adult Education, Vol. 29, p. 355

...Today, in all countries, the word "Bolshevik" and the word "Soviet" have ceased to be regarded as queer terms, as they were only recently, like the word "Boxer", which we repeated without understanding what it meant. The word "Bolshevik" and the word "Soviet" are now being repeated in all the languages of the world.

Deception of the People with Slogans of Freedom and Equality, May 19, 1919, First All-Russia Congress on Adult Education, Vol. 29, p. 374

* ...Notwithstanding the extremely difficult conditions that prevail, and the fact that the first socialist revolution in history is taking place in a country with a very low level of culture, notwithstanding this, Soviet power has already won the recognition of the workers of other countries. The phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat" is a Latin phrase, and the working people who heard it for the first time did not know what it meant, and did not know how it could be instituted. Now this Latin phrase has been translated into the modern languages and we have shown that the dictatorship of the proletariat is Soviet power, the government under which the workers organise themselves and say that their organisation is superior to every other. No idler, no exploiter can belong to this organisation. This organisation has but one object, and that is, to overthrow capitalism. No false slogans, no fetishes like "freedom" and "equality", will deceive us. We recognise no freedom, no equality, no labour democracy if it conflicts with the cause of emancipating labour from the yoke of capital. This is what we incorporated in the Soviet Constitution, and we have already won for it the sympathies of the workers of all countries....

Deception of the People with Slogans of Freedom and Equality, May 19, 1919, First All-Russia Congress on Adult Education, Vol. 29, p. 375-76

...The word "commune" is being handled much too freely. Any kind of enterprise started by Communists or with their participation is very often at once declared to be a "commune", it being not infrequently forgotten that this *very honourable title* must be won by prolonged and persistent effort, by *practical* achievement in genuine communist development.

That is why, in my opinion, the decision that has matured in the minds of the majority of the members of the Central Executive Committee to *repeal* the decree of the Council of People's Commissars, as far as it pertains to the title "consumers' communes",¹⁶⁸ is quite right. Let the title be simpler—and, incidentally, the defects and shortcomings of the *initial* stages of the new organisational work will not be blamed on the "communes", but (as in all fairness they should be) on *bad* Communists. It would be a good thing to eliminate the word "commune" from *common* use, to prohibit every Tom, Dick and Harry from grabbing at it, or to *allow this title to be borne only* by genuine communes, which have really demonstrated in practice (and have proved by the unanimous recognition of the whole of the surrounding population) that they are capable of organising their work in a communist manner. First show that you are capable of working without remuneration in the interests of society, in the interests of all the working people, show that you are capable of "working in a revolutionary way", that you are capable of raising productivity of labour, of organising the work in an exemplary manner, and then hold out your hand for the honourable title "commune"!

A Great Beginning. Heroism of the Workers in the Rear "Communist Subbotniks", Vol. 29, p. 431

...As early as the period of slavery we find diverse forms of the state in the countries that were the most advanced, cultured and civilised according to the standards of the time—for example, in ancient Greece and Rome—which were based entirely on slavery.... A monarchy is the power of a single person, a republic is the absence of any non-elected authority; an aristocracy is the power of a relatively small minority, a democracy is the power of the people (democracy in Greek literally means the power of the people). All these differences arose in the epoch of slavery....

The State. A Lecture Delivered at the Sverdlov University, July 11, 1919. Vol. 29, p. 479

...Incidentally, the name "Spartacist" now adopted by the German Communists—the only German party which is really fighting against the yoke of capitalism—was adopted by

them because Spartacus was one of the most prominent heroes of one of the greatest revolts of slaves, which took place about two thousand years ago. For many years the seemingly omnipotent Roman Empire, which rested entirely on slavery, experienced the shocks and blows of a widespread uprising of slaves who armed and united to form a vast army under the leadership of Spartacus.

The State A Lecture Delivered at the
Sverdlov University July 11, 1919
Vol. 29 p. 481

[The peasant] has been accustomed for centuries to expect only oppression from the state and he is therefore in the habit of regarding everything that comes from the state with suspicion. And if the agricultural communes give assistance to the peasants merely for the purpose of fulfilling the letter of the law, such assistance will be not only useless but harmful. For the name "agricultural commune" is a great one; it is associated with the conception of communism. It will be a good thing if the communes show in practice that they are indeed seriously working for the improvement of peasant farming, that will undoubtedly enhance the prestige of the Communists and the Communist Party. But it has frequently happened that the communes have only succeeded in provoking a negative attitude among the peasants, and the word "commune" has even at times become a call to fight communism. And this happened not only when stupid attempts were made to drive the peasants into the communes by force. The absurdity of this was so obvious that the Soviet government long ago forbade it.

*Speech Delivered at the First Congress of
Agricultural Communes and Agricultural
Arts, December 4, 1919, Vol. 30
pp. 197-98.*

To bear this out, I would refer to what in our cities has been called *subbotniks*.¹⁶¹ This is the name given to the several hours' unpaid voluntary work done by city workers over and above the usual working day and devoted to some public need. The *subbotniks* were initiated in Moscow by the workers of the Moscow-Kazan Railway. One of the appeals of the Soviet government pointed out that the Red Army men at the front are making unprecedented sacrifices, and that,

in spite of all the hardships they are obliged to undergo, they are gaining unprecedented victories over our enemies, and at the same time stated that we can clinch our victories only if such heroism and such self-sacrifice are displayed not only at the front, but also in the rear. The Moscow workers responded to this appeal by organising subbotniks.

Speech Delivered at the First Congress of Agricultural Communes and Agricultural Artels, December 4, 1919, Vol. 30, p. 202

...Despite the fact that we call ourselves the Communist Party, and that the name "Communist" is a scientific, European term, it is not as widespread in European and other countries as the word "Bolshevik" is. Our Russian word "Soviet" is one of the most widely used; it is not even translated into other languages, but is pronounced everywhere in Russian.

Speech at a Meeting of the Moscow Soviet in Celebration of the First Anniversary of the Third International, March 6, 1920, Vol 30, p 418

Comrades, Serrati has said that we have not yet invented a sincerometer—meaning by this French neologism an instrument for measuring sincerity. No such instrument has been invented yet. We have no need of one. But we do already have an instrument for defining trends. Comrade Serrati's error, which I shall deal with later, consists in his having failed to use this instrument, which has been known for a long time.

Speech on the Terms of Admission into the Communist International, July 30, Second Congress of the Communist International, Vol 31, p 246

...But the majority of the peasants must support the working class because the workers have come to power for the first time in history, and because power has been taken by the class that had been most exploited. They have realised that the working class is right, and have withdrawn their support from the bourgeoisie, which, by the way, they regard as a term of abuse. I met a peasant who complained about

present conditions and was obviously not in sympathy with the Soviet government's food policy, and certain other issues. The poor peasants of his district had called him a "bourgeois", and he felt this to be an affront. "I refuse to be called by such a disgraceful name," he said. And there is a world of meaning in the fact that this term has come to be regarded as an odious one by the peasants—even the well-to-do middle peasants who have worked with their own hands, who know what it takes to earn a living, and who have been exploited by landowners and capitalists (and that is something they have all experienced). It is the basis of our propaganda and agitation, and the influence exercised by the working class through the state. It is this support of the peasant masses that the working class is assured of in spite of the resistance of the rich and profiteering crowd.

Speech Delivered at the Fourth All-Russia Congress of Garment Workers, February 6, 1921, Vol. 32, pp. 118-119

...You write that I have "slipped up". On the one hand, you say, by leasing forests, lands, etc., we are introducing *state capitalism*, and on the other hand, he (Lenin) "talks" about "expropriating the landowners".

This seems to you a contradiction.

You are mistaken. Expropriation means *deprivation of property*. A lessee is *not* a property-owner. That means there is no contradiction.

The introduction of capitalism (*in moderation* and skilfully, as I say more than once in my pamphlet¹⁶⁵) is possible without restoring the landowners' property. A lease is a contract *for a period*. Both ownership and control remain *with us*, the workers' state.

To M. F. Sokolov, May 16, 1921, Vol. 35, p. 491

..."Green coal" (the utilisation of small local water power resources for electrification),...

The Tax in Kind (The Significance of the New Policy and Its Conditions), Vol. 32, p. 354

My chief amendment is aimed at deleting the passage

which calls the leaders of the II and II 1/2 Internationals accomplices of the world bourgeoisie.¹⁶⁶ You might as well call a man a "jackass". It is absolutely unreasonable to risk wrecking an affair of tremendous practical importance for the sake of giving oneself the extra pleasure of scolding scoundrels, whom we shall be scolding a thousand times at another place and time.

Letter to Members of the Politbureau of the C.C., R.C.P.(B) with Remarks to the Draft Resolution for the First Extended Plenary Meeting of the Comintern Executive on Participation in a Conference of the Three Internationals, Vol. 12, pp. 400-01

The term "Nepman" that you use leads to some misunderstanding. This word is made up of the abbreviation NEP, which stands for "New Economic Policy", and the word "man". Together it means "a man, or representative, of this New Economic Policy". This term first arose as a journalese nickname for the small huckster, or individual who took advantage of the free market for all sorts of abuses.

Outwardly, what strikes the eye most in the New Economic Policy is that people like the "Nepman", that is, people of all sorts who "buy and sell", as you say, come to the fore.

But the actual economic activities of the actual majority of the population by no means consist in this. For example, it is sufficient to point to the activities of the vast masses of the peasantry who, precisely at the present time, are displaying tremendous energy and self-sacrifice in restoring their tillage, their agricultural implements, their houses, farm buildings, etc. On the other hand, at this very moment the industrial workers are displaying equal energy in improving their tools, in replacing worn out tools by new ones, in restoring wrecked, dilapidated or damaged buildings, etc.

The "Nepmen", if we are to employ this term, which belongs rather to the realm of journalese than to the realm of serious political economy, make more noise than their economic power warrants. I am therefore afraid that anybody who in a vulgarised way applied to our "Nepmen"

the proposition of historical materialism that economic power must be followed by political power, is in danger of falling into serious error, and even of becoming the victim of a series of ridiculous misunderstandings.

Interview with Arthur Ransome, "Manchester Guardian" Correspondent Second version, Vol. 33, 106-07

Let us hope that our new Workers' and Peasants' Inspection¹⁶⁷ will abandon what the French call *pruderie*, which we may call ridiculous primness, or ridiculous swank, and which plays entirely into the hands of our Soviet and Party bureaucracy.

Better Fewer, but Better, Vol. 33, p. 491

...Postnikov has fully proved his point on the "tremendous diversity" in the economic status of the various households. This diversity applies not only to the property status of the peasants and the size of the areas they cultivate, but even to the character of the farming in the different groups. That is still not all. It turns out that the terms "diversity" and "differentiation" are inadequate for a full description of the phenomenon. When one peasant owns one draught animal and another 10, we call that differentiation; but when one rents scores of dessiatines of land above the allotment that satisfies his needs, with the sole object of deriving profit from its exploitation, thus depriving another peasant of the opportunity of renting land which he requires in order to feed his family, we obviously are faced with something much bigger; we have to call that sort of thing "strife" (p. 323), a "struggle of economic interests" (p. XXXII). Although he employs these terms, Postnikov does not fully appreciate their importance; nor does he see that the terms themselves are inadequate. To rent allotment land from the impoverished section of the population, and to hire as a labourer the peasant who has ceased to run his own farm is something more than mere strife—it is downright exploitation.

New Economic Developments in Peasant Life, (On V. Y. Postnikov's Peasant Farming in South Russia), Vol. 1, pp. 43-44

...The employment of hired labour in the top group¹⁶⁸ must therefore be on a larger scale than the author estimates, so that the big money income obtained by the peasants of this group largely (if not entirely) represents income from *capital*, in the specific meaning of that term given to it by scientific political economy.

New Economic Developments in Peasant Life (On V. Y. Postnikov's *Peasant Farming in South Russia*), Vol. 1, p. 68

To correct the diagram given above¹⁶⁹ we must begin by ascertaining the content of the concepts dealt with. By commodity production is meant an organisation of social economy in which goods are produced by separate, isolated producers, each specialising in the making of some one product, so that to satisfy the needs of society it is necessary to buy and sell products (which, therefore, become commodities) in the market. By capitalism is meant that stage of the development of commodity production at which not only the products of human labour, but human labour-power itself becomes a commodity.

On the So-Called Market Question, Vol. 1, p. 93

...The question of the market is entirely eliminated, because the market is nothing other than the expression of that division of labour and commodity production....

On the So-Called Market Question, Vol. 1, p. 108

Another reason why the "friends of the people"¹⁷⁰ so freely ignore facts of this kind is that their conception of capitalism has not advanced beyond the commonplace vulgar idea that a capitalist is a wealthy and educated employer who runs a large machine enterprise—and they refuse to consider the scientific content of the term.

What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats, Vol. 1, pp. 208-09

The "friends of the people," ... simply cannot grasp the point that *capital* is a certain relation between people, a

relation which remains the same whether the categories under comparison are at a higher or a lower level of development. Bourgeois economists have never been able to understand this, they have always objected to such a definition of capital. I recall how one of them, writing in *Russkaya Mysl*¹⁷¹ about Sieber's book (on Marx's theory), quoted this definition (capital is a relation), and indignantly put exclamation marks after it:

*What the Friends of the People Are
and How They Fight the Social
Democrats* Vol. I p. 217

According to the terminology established in our liberal and Narodnik press, the meaning of the word "people's" is one that rules out the exploitation of the one who works—so that by the definition he gives the author¹⁷² actually conceals the undoubted fact that in our peasant economy there is the very same appropriation of surplus-value, the very same work for others as prevail outside of the "community" and so opens the doors wide to sentimental and unctuous Pharisaism.

*The Economic Content of Narodism and
the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book*
Vol. I p. 365

I use the expression "petty bourgeois" not in the ordinary, but in the political-economic sense. A small producer, operating under a system of commodity economy—these are the two features of the concept "petty bourgeois," Kleinburger, or what is the same thing, the Russian *meshchanin*. It thus includes both the peasant and the handicraftsman, whom the Narodniks always placed on the same footing—and quite rightly, for they are both producers, they both work for the market, and differ only in the degree of development of commodity economy.

*The Economic Content of Narodism and
Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book*
Vol. I p. 396

This mistake of Ephrussi's was due to the very same narrow interpretation of the terms "petty-bourgeois" doctrine and "reactionary" doctrine referred to above in

connection with the first of these terms.¹⁷³ They by no means imply the selfish greed of the small shopkeeper, or a desire to halt social development, to turn back: they simply indicate the given author's *mistaken* point of view, his limited understanding and narrow outlook, which prompt the choice of means (for the achievement of very good aims) that cannot be effective in practice, and that can satisfy only the small producer or be of service to the defenders of the past.

A Characterisation of Economic Romanticism, Vol. 2, p. 243

3) The sum-total of all the economic contradictions among the peasantry constitutes what we call the differentiation of the peasantry. The peasants themselves very aptly and strikingly characterise this process with the term "depeasantising."

The Development of Capitalism in Russia, Vol. 3, p. 173

...The autocracy (absolutism, unlimited monarchy) is a form of rule under which all supreme power is wielded wholly and indivisibly by an absolute monarch, the tsar....

A Retrograde Trend in Russian Social Democracy, Vol. 4, p. 264

...This type of government in which the people participate in legislation and administration is called the *constitutional* form of government (constitution=law on the participation of people's representatives in legislation and the administration of the state)....

A Retrograde Trend in Russian Social-Democracy, Vol. 4, p. 265

Capitalism is the name given to that social system under which the land, factories, implements, etc., belong to a small number of landed proprietors and capitalists, while the mass of the people possesses no property, or very little property, and is compelled to hire itself out as workers.

On Strikes, Vol. 4, p. 311

...The first issue of *Rabochaya Mysl*¹⁷⁴ shows that the term

Economism" (which, of course, we do not propose to abandon, since, in one way or another, this designation has already established itself) does not adequately convey the real character of the new trend

What Is to Be Done Burning Questions of Our Movement Vol. 5 p. 586

This new and better society is called *socialist society*. The teachings about this society are called *socialism*. The workers' unions which fight for this better order of society are called *Social-Democratic parties*.

To the Rural Poor Vol. 6 p. 361

Throughout the whole of Europe workers who own no land and no workshops and work for other people for wages all their lives are called *proletarians*.

To the Rural Poor vol. 6 p. 369

Bourgeois means a property-owner. The bourgeoisie are all the property-owners taken together. A big bourgeois is the owner of big property. A petty bourgeois is the owner of small property. The words bourgeoisie and proletariat mean the same as property-owners and workers, the rich and the poor, or those who live on the labour of others and those who work for others for wages.

To the Rural Poor Vol. 6 p. 374
footnote

A programme is a brief, clear and precise statement of all the things a party is striving and fighting for.

To the Rural Poor Vol. 6 p. 396

Indirect taxes are such taxes that are not imposed directly on land or on a house but are paid by the people *indirectly* in the form of higher prices for what they buy.

To the Rural Poor Vol. 6 p. 400

What is the *class struggle*? It is a struggle of one part of the people against the other, a struggle waged by the masses of those who have no rights, are oppressed and engaged in toil, against the privileged, the oppressors and drones: a struggle

of the wage-labourers, or proletarians, against the property-owners, or bourgeoisie.

To the Rural Poor, Vol. 6, p. 421

...Confiscation means alienation of property without compensation....

Reply to Criticism of Our Draft Programme, Vol. 6, p. 436

...When there are two sides, each with its definite trend, irresolute waverers between the two are described by the term "Marsh", instead of which one could, I suppose, use "golden mean".

Speeches on Measures to Restore Peace in the Party, January 16(29), Session of the Council of the R.S.D.I.P., Vol. 7, p. 170

...The word bureaucracy might be translated into Russian as concentration on place and position. Bureaucracy means subordinating the interests of the *work* to the interests of one's own *career*; it means focusing attention on *places* and ignoring the work itself; it means wrangling over *co-optation* instead of fighting for *ideas*....

One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, Vol. 7, p. 362

...It was not so very long ago that the only manifestation of the people's struggle against the autocracy was *revolts*—unconscious, unorganised, spontaneous, sometimes wild outbreaks...

The Revolutionary Army and the Revolutionary Government, Vol. 8, p. 560

By the Party's tactics we mean the Party's political conduct, or the character, direction, and methods of its political activity. Tactical resolutions are adopted by Party congresses in order to accurately define the political conduct of the Party as a whole with regard to new tasks or in view of a new political situation.

Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, Vol. 9, p. 22

...Indeed, the "conquest of power" by Social-Democracy is precisely a socialist revolution, nor can it be anything else if

we use these words in their direct and usual meaning

*Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the
Democratic Revolution Vol 9 p 32*

Let us see whether the restrictions the Conference¹⁷⁵ imposed on the formation of revolutionary governments and on participation in them, which are now admitted in principle, are reasonable. We are not aware of the distinction between "episodic" and "provisional" * We are afraid that the former word, which is "new" and foreign, is merely a screen for lack of clear thinking

*Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the
Democratic Revolution Vol 9 p 39*

What is meant by "revolutionary communes"? Does this concept differ from "a provisional revolutionary government", and, if so, in what respect? The gentlemen of the Conference do not know themselves. Confusion of revolutionary thought leads them, as very often happens, to *revolutionary phrase-mongering*. Indeed, the use of the words "revolutionary commune" in a resolution passed by representatives of Social-Democracy is revolutionary phrase-mongering and nothing else. Marx often condemned such phrase-mongering in which some "charming" terms from the *outworn past* are used to conceal the tasks of the future. In such cases the charm of a term which has already played its part in history becomes so much useless and harmful tinsel, a child's rattle. We must give the workers and the whole people a clear and unambiguous notion as to *why* we want a provisional revolutionary government to be set up, and *exactly what changes* we shall bring about if we exercise decisive influence on the government on the very day following the victory of the popular insurrection which has already commenced

*Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the
Democratic Revolution Vol 9 p 80*

A republic and an armed uprising are definite political categories. Opposition is a purely parliamentary term. This

* The first word was in scholarly use at the time while the second was and still is, colloquial Russian — *Ed*

term is so vague that it can include the Octobrists, and the Party of Peaceful Renovation,¹⁷⁶ and, in fact, all who are dissatisfied with the government....

Blocs with the Cadets, Vol. 11, p. 311

What *mass* organisations can grow on the soil of *group* needs, the Lord alone knows. By group, something small is always meant, something diametrically opposed to the mass. The authors of the resolution string words together without thinking of concrete, definite content.

What then does this mean—mass organisations on the soil of *local* needs? What sort of organisation the authors have in mind is again not clear. If they are talking about such organisations as consumers' societies, co-operatives, etc., their distinctive feature is certainly not their *local* character. The Mensheviks' love of platitudinous phrases, their evasion of the *concrete* exposition of a question, is a purely intellectualist trait. It is at root alien to the proletariat, and harmful from the standpoint of the proletariat.

Angry Embarrassment (The Question of the Labour Congress), Vol. 12, pp. 320-21

...All boycott is a struggle, not within the framework of a given institution, but against its emergence, or, to put it more broadly, against it becoming operative....

Against Boycott. Notes of a Social-Democratic Publicist, Vol. 13, p. 19

...The connection between boycott and the broad revolutionary upswing is thus obvious: boycott is the most decisive means of struggle, which rejects not the form of organisation of the given institution, but its very existence. Boycott is a declaration of open war against the old regime, a direct attack upon it....

Against Boycott. Notes of a Social-Democratic Publicist, Vol. 13, p. 25

Nationalisation is the transfer of all the land to the *ownership* of the state. State ownership means that the state is entitled to draw the rent from the land and to lay down

general rules governing the possession and use of the land for the whole country

*The Agrarian Programme of Social
Democracy in the First Russian Revolution
1905-1907 Vol. 15 p. 337*

That the peasantry is a class of petty *proprietors* that can "strike together" against the landlords and the autocracy, "on the same side of the barricades" with the proletariat in the bourgeois revolution, and that in *this* revolution it can, in certain cases, march in "alliance" with the proletariat, while remaining quite a separate class of capitalist society

*How the Socialist Revolutionaries Sum
Up the Revolution and How the Revolution
Has Summed Them Up Vol. 15
p. 331*

The Socialist-Revolutionaries¹⁷ have *always* used the term *trudovoe* peasantry. The revolution revealed the political physiognomy of the present-day Russian peasantry and has proved it to be a *Trudovik* trend. In that case the Socialist-Revolutionaries were right, you will say. That is not so. History in its irony has preserved and perpetuated the Socialist-Revolutionaries' *term*, but gave it the *connotation* that was predicted by the Social-Democrats. On the moot question as to the petty-bourgeois nature of the labouring peasantry, the history of the revolution has shared the honours between us and the Socialist-Revolutionaries as follows: to them it gave the *word* and to us the *substance*. The labouring peasants, whom the Socialist-Revolutionaries lauded to the skies *before* the revolution, proved *during* the revolution to be such *Trudoviks* that the Socialist-Revolutionaries *had* to disown them!

*How the Socialist Revolutionaries Sum
Up the Revolution and How the Revolution
Has Summed Them Up Vol. 15
p. 334*

The desertions from the Party mean its purification, they mean getting rid of its least stable element, of its unreliable friends, of its "fellow-travellers" (*Mitläufer*), who always joined the proletariat for a while and who were recruited from among the petty bourgeoisie or from among the

“declassed”, i.e., people thrown out of the orbit of some definite class.

On the Road, Vol. 15, pp. 353-54

...A fighting agreement cannot be contraposed to a political bloc, for the latter concept embraces the former. A political bloc at various historical moments takes the form either of “a fighting agreement” in connection with insurrection, or of a parliamentary agreement for “joint action against the Black Hundreds and Cadets”, and so on.

The Aim of the Proletarian Struggle in Our Revolution, Vol. 15, p. 373

Fideism is a doctrine which substitutes faith for knowledge, or which generally attaches significance to faith.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Vol. 14, p. 19, footnote

Frankly and bluntly did Bishop Berkeley argue! In our time these very same thoughts on the “economical” elimination of “matter” from philosophy are enveloped in a much more artful form, and confused by the use of a “new” terminology so that these thoughts may be taken by naïve people for “recent” philosophy!

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Vol. 14, p. 29

For every scientist who has not been led astray by professorial philosophy, as well as for every materialist, sensation is indeed the direct connection between consciousness and the external world; it is the transformation of the energy of external excitation into the fact of consciousness. This transformation has been, and is, observed by each of us a million times on every hand. The sophism of idealist philosophy consists in the fact that it regards sensation as being not the connection between consciousness and the external world, but a fence, a wall, separating consciousness from the external world—not an image of the external phenomenon corresponding to the sensation, but as the “sole entity”.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism, Vol. 14, p. 51

Just such gibberish, and of this a word or two will suffice, is the special terminology of Avenarius, who coined a plenitude of diverse "notals", "securals", "fidentials", etc., etc. Our Russian Machists for the most part shamefacedly avoid this professorial rigmarole, and only now and again bombard the reader (in order to stun him) with an "existential" and such like. But if naïve people take these words for a species of bio-mechanics, the German philosophers, who are themselves lovers of "erudite" words, laugh at Avenarius. To say "notal" (*notus*=known), or to say that this or the other thing is known to me, is absolutely one and the same, says Wundt in the section entitled "Scholastic Character of the Empirio-critical System". And, indeed, it is the purest and most dreary scholasticism.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, p. 93

It may be asked in what way the position of the agnostic as outlined by Engels differs from the position of Mach? In the "new" term "element"? But it is sheer childishness to believe that a nomenclature can change a philosophical line, that sensations when called "elements" cease to be sensations!

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, p. 108

...We materialists follow Engels in calling the Kantians and Humeans *agnostics* because they deny objective reality as the source of our sensations. Agnostic is a Greek word: *a* in Greek means "no", *gnosis* "knowledge".

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, p. 128

...Matter is a philosophical category denoting the objective reality which is given to man by his sensations, and which is copied, photographed and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them. Therefore, to say that such a concept can become "antiquated" is *childish talk*, a senseless repetition of the arguments of fashionable *reactionary* philosophy.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, p. 130

...Note: Mr. Bazarov refers to that question as "notorious", i.e., one that had been raised before, that was already known in April 1910!

Marxism and "Nasha Zarya", Vol. 17,
p. 55-56

...A split means the formation of *two* political collectives instead of one....

Against Unity—With the Liquidators,
Vol. 17, p. 495

Democracy is the rule of the majority. Only universal, direct and equal elections can be called democratic. Only such committees are democratic as have been elected by the *entire* population on the basis of universal suffrage. This follows from the general, basic, elementary truths of democracy so indisputably that it even seems strange to have to explain it to the Cadet gentlemen.

The Cadets and the Agrarian Question,
Vol. 18, p. 282

A revolutionary is not one who becomes revolutionary with the onset of the revolution, but one who defends the principles and slogans of the revolution when reaction is most violent and when liberals and democrats vacillate to the greatest degree. A revolutionary is one who *teaches the masses* to struggle in a revolutionary manner and nobody can possibly force (make a "forecast" of) the results of that "teaching".

Notes of a Publicist, Vol. 19, pp. 231-32

...Agnosticism (from the Greek words "a" *no* and "gnosis" *knowledge*) is vacillation between materialism and idealism, i.e., in practice it is vacillation between materialist science and clericalism....

Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the Death of Joseph Dietzgen, Vol. 19, p. 80

...Reformism is bourgeois deception of the workers, who, despite individual improvements, will always remain wage-slaves, as long as there is the domination of capital.

Marxism and Reformism, Vol. 19,
p. 372

The Party is the sum-total of its organisations linked together in a single whole. The Party is the organisation of the working class divided into a long chain of all kinds of local and special, central and general organisations.

How Vera Zasulich Demolishes Liquidationism Vol. 19 p. 402

The party is the politically conscious advanced section of the class, it is its vanguard. The strength of that vanguard is ten times, a hundred times more than a hundred times greater than its numbers.

How Vera Zasulich Demolishes Liquidationism Vol. 19 p. 406

Lockouts, i.e., the mass discharge of workers by common agreement among employers, is as necessary and inevitable a phenomenon in capitalist society as strikes are.

Forms of the Working-Class Movement
(The Lockout and Marxist Tactics)
Vol. 20 p. 209

The opportunists are bourgeois enemies of the proletarian revolution who in peaceful times carry on their bourgeois work in secret, concealing themselves within the workers' parties, while in times of crisis they *immediately* prove to be open allies of the *entire* united bourgeoisie, from the conservative to the most radical and democratic part of the latter, from the free thinkers to the religious and clerical sections.

What Next? On the Task of Confronting the Workers' Parties with regard to Opportunism and Social Chauvinism Vol. 21 p. 110

If it were necessary to give the briefest possible definition of imperialism we should have to say that imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism. Such a definition would include what is most important for, on the one hand, finance capital is the bank capital of a few very big monopolist banks merged with the capital of the monopolist associations of industrialists, and, on the other hand, the division of the world is the transition from a colonial policy which has extended without hindrance to territories unseized

by any capitalist power, to a colonial policy of monopolist possession of the territory of the world, which has been completely divided up.

But very brief definitions, although convenient, for they sum up the main points, are nevertheless inadequate, since we have to deduce from them some especially important features of the phenomenon that has to be defined. And so, without forgetting the conditional and relative value of all definitions in general, which can never embrace all the concatenations of a phenomenon in its full development, we must give a definition of imperialism that will include the following five of its basic features:

(1) the concentration of production and capital has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life; (2) the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this "finance capital", of a financial oligarchy; (3) the export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance; (4) the formation of international monopolist capitalist associations which share the world among themselves, and (5) the territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed.

Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, Vol. 22. p. 266

...The concept of annexation usually includes: (1) the concept of force (joining by means of force); (2) the concept of oppression by another nation (the joining of "alien" regions, etc.), and, sometimes (3) the concept of violation of the *status quo*....

The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up, Vol. 22, p. 328

What, generally speaking, is "defence of the fatherland"? Is it a scientific concept relating to economics, politics, etc.? No. It is a much bandied about current expression, sometimes simply a philistine phrase, intended to *justify the war*.

A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, Vol. 23, p. 32

Economically, imperialism (or the "era" of finance capital—it is not a matter of words) is the highest stage in the development of capitalism, one in which production has assumed such big, immense proportions that *free competition gives way to monopoly*. That is the *economic* essence of imperialism. Monopoly manifests itself in trusts, syndicates, etc., in the omnipotence of the giant banks, in the buying up of raw material sources, etc., in the concentration of banking capital, etc. Everything hinges on economic monopoly.

A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, Vol. 23, p. 42

The name "Social-Democracy" is *scientifically* incorrect, as Marx frequently pointed out, in particular, in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* in 1875, and as Engels reaffirmed in a more popular form in 1894. From capitalism mankind can pass directly only to socialism, i.e., to the social ownership of the means of production and the distribution of products according to the amount of work performed by each individual. Our Party looks farther ahead: socialism must inevitably evolve gradually into communism, upon the banner of which is inscribed the motto, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs".

That is my first argument.

Here is the second: the second part of the name of our Party (*Social-Democrats*) is also scientifically incorrect. Democracy is a form of *state*, whereas we Marxists are opposed to *every kind* of state.

The leaders of the Second International (1889-1914), Plekhanov, Kautsky and their like, have vulgarised and distorted Marxism.

Marxism differs from anarchism in that it recognises *the need for a state* for the purpose of the transition to socialism; but (and here is where we differ from Kautsky and Co.) *not a state of the type* of the usual parliamentary bourgeois-democratic republic, but a state like the Paris Commune of 1871¹⁷⁸ and the Soviets of Workers' Deputies of 1905 and 1917.

My third argument: *living reality*, the revolution, has *already actually* established in our country, albeit in a weak and embryonic form, precisely this new type of "state", which is not a state in the proper sense of the word....

The term democracy is not only scientifically incorrect when applied to a Communist Party; it has now, since March 1917,¹⁷⁹ simply become *blinkers* put on the eyes of the revolutionary people and *preventing* them from boldly and freely, on their own initiative, building up the new: the Soviets of Workers', Peasants', and all other Deputies, as *the sole power* in the "state" and as the harbinger of the "withering away" of the state *in every form*.

My fourth argument: we must reckon with the actual situation in which socialism finds itself internationally.

It is not what it was during the years 1871 to 1914, when Marx and Engels knowingly put up with the inaccurate, opportunist term "Social-Democracy". For *in those days*, after the defeat of the Paris Commune, history made slow organisational and educational work the task of the day. Nothing else was possible.

The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution, Vol. 24, p. 84-86

...The Soviets are an institution which does not exist in any ordinary bourgeois-parliamentary state and cannot exist side by side with a bourgeois government. They are the new, more democratic type of state which we in our Party resolutions call a peasant-proletarian democratic republic, with power belonging solely to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies....

Speech on the Attitude Towards the Provisional Government, June 4(17). First All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, Vol. 25, p. 18

...The dictatorship of the proletariat is a scientific term indicating the class which plays the leading role in it and the special form of state power called dictatorship, i.e., power based not on law or elections, but directly on the armed force of a particular section of the population.

An Epidemic of Credulity, Vol. 25, p. 65

1. The dialectician Engels remained true to dialectics to the end of his days. Marx and I, he said, had a splendid, scientifically 'exact' name for the party, but there was no real

party, i.e., no mass proletarian party. Now (at the end of the nineteenth century) there was a real party, but its name was scientifically wrong. Never mind, it would “pass muster”, so long as the party *developed*, so long as the scientific inaccuracy of its name was not hidden from it and did not hinder its development in the right direction!

Perhaps some wit would console us Bolsheviks in the manner of Engels: we have a real party, it is developing splendidly; even such a meaningless and ugly term as “Bolshevik” will “pass muster”, although it expresses nothing whatever but the purely accidental fact that at the Brussels-London Congress of 1903 we were in the majority....* Perhaps now that the persecution of our Party by republicans and “revolutionary” petty-bourgeois democrats in July and August has earned the name “Bolshevik” such universal respect, now that, in addition, this persecution marks the tremendous historical progress our Party has made in its *real* development—perhaps now even I might hesitate to insist on the suggestion I made in April to change the name of our Party. Perhaps I would propose a “compromise” to my comrades, namely, to call ourselves the Communist Party, but to retain the word “Bolsheviks” in brackets.

The State and Revolution, Vol. 25,
p. 460

Bonapartism (from Bonaparte, the name of the two French emperors) is a name applied to a government which endeavours to appear non-partisan by taking advantage of a highly acute struggle between the parties of the capitalists and the workers. Actually serving the capitalists, such a government dupes the workers most of all by promises and petty concessions.

Lessons of the Revolution, Vol. 25,
p. 240, footnote

Blackmail is the extortion of money under threat of exposing certain facts or invented “stories” which may be disagreeable to the person concerned, or under threat of causing him some other unpleasantness.

* Majority in Russian is *bolshinstvo*; hence the name *Bolshevik*.—Tr.

Political blackmail is the threat of exposing, or the actual exposure, of true, but more often invented, "stories" with the aim of causing an opponent political damage, of slandering him, of depriving him of the possibility of engaging in political activity, or of making it difficult for him.

Political Blackmail, Vol. 25, p. 261

The term compromise in politics implies the surrender of certain demands, the renunciation of part of one's demands, by agreement with another party.

On Compromises, Vol 25, p. 309

...Instead of the word self-determination, which has given rise to numerous misinterpretations, I propose the perfectly precise concept: "the right to free secession". After six months' experience of the 1917 Revolution, it is hardly possible to dispute that the party of the revolutionary proletariat of Russia, the party which uses the Great-Russian language, is obliged to recognise the right to secede. When we win power, we shall immediately and unconditionally recognise this right for Finland, the Ukraine, Armenia, and any other nationality oppressed by tsarism (and the Great-Russian bourgeoisie). On the other hand, we do not at all favour secession....

Revision of the Party Programme,
Vol 26, pp 175-76

...To those who have been in the workers' movement for some time, who were connected with the workers in the old days, and who had close contacts with the factories, it is clear that this past year has been one of genuine proletarian dictatorship. This concept used to be mysterious book Latin, a mouthful of incomprehensible words. Intellectuals sought an explanation of the concept in learned works, which only gave them a hazy notion of what the proletarian dictatorship was all about. The chief thing that stands to our credit during this past year is that we have translated these words from abstruse Latin into plain Russian. During this past year the working class has not been engaged in idle philosophising, but in the practical work of creating and exercising a

proletarian dictatorship, despite the excited mental state of the intellectuals.

*Speech at a Ceremonial Meeting of the
All-Russia Central and Moscow Trade
Union Councils, November 6, 1918,
Vol. 28, p. 131*

But, after all, the title of Kautsky's pamphlet is *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*.¹⁸⁰ Everybody knows that this is the very essence of Marx's doctrine; and after a lot of irrelevant twaddle Kautsky was obliged to quote Marx's words on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But the way in which he the "Marxist" did it was simply farcical! Listen to this:

"This view" (which Kautsky dubs "contempt for democracy") "rests upon a single word of Karl Marx's". This is what Kautsky literally says on page 20. And on page 60 the same thing is repeated even in the form that they (the Bolsheviki) "opportunistically recalled the little word" (that is literally what he says—*des Wörtchens!*) "about the dictatorship of the proletariat which Marx once used in 1875 in a letter".

Here is Marx's "little word":

"Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

...To call this classical reasoning of Marx's which sums up the whole of his revolutionary teaching, "a single word" and even "a little word", is an insult to and complete renunciation of Marxism.

*The Proletarian Revolution and the
Renegade Kautsky, Vol. 28, p. 233*

Kautsky chose to approach the question in such a way as to begin with a definition of the "word" dictatorship.

Very well. Everyone has a sacred right to approach a question in whatever way he pleases. One must only distinguish a serious and honest approach from a dishonest one. Anyone who wants to be serious in approaching the question in this way ought to give *his own definition* of the "word". Then the question would be put fairly and squarely. But Kautsky does not do that. "Literally", he writes, "the word dictatorship means the abolition of democracy."

In the first place, this is not a definition. If Kautsky wanted to avoid giving a definition of the concept dictatorship, why did he choose this particular approach to the question?

Secondly, it is obviously wrong. It is natural for a liberal to speak of "democracy" in general; but a Marxist will never forget to ask: "for what class?" Everyone knows, for instance (and Kautsky the "historian" knows it too), that rebellions, or even strong ferment, among the slaves in ancient times at once revealed the fact that the ancient state was essentially a *dictatorship of the slaveowners*. Did this dictatorship abolish democracy *among*, and *for*, the slaveowners? Everybody knows that it did not.

*The Proletarian Revolution and the
Renegade Kautsky*, Vol. 28, pp. 234-35

Kautsky first committed a sleight of hand by proclaiming the obvious nonsense that the word dictatorship, in its literal sense, means the dictatorship of a single person, and then—on the strength of this sleight of hand—he declared that "hence" Marx's words about the dictatorship of a class were *not* meant in the literal sense (but in one in which dictatorship does not imply revolutionary violence, but the "peaceful" winning of a majority under bourgeois—mark you—"democracy").

One must, if you please, distinguish between a "condition" and a "form of government". A wonderfully profound distinction; it is like drawing a distinction between the "condition" of stupidity of a man who reasons foolishly and the "form" of his stupidity.

Kautsky *finds it necessary* to interpret dictatorship as a "condition of domination" (this is the literal expression he uses on the very next page, p. 21), because then *revolutionary violence, and violent revolution, disappear*. The "condition of domination" is a condition in which any majority finds itself under ... "democracy"! Thanks to such a fraud, *revolution happily disappears!*

*The Proletarian Revolution and the
Renegade Kautsky*, Vol. 28, p. 237

The Soviets are the direct organisation of the working and exploited people themselves, which *helps* them to organise and administer their own state in every possible way. And in this it is the vanguard of the working and exploited people, the urban proletariat, that enjoys the advantage of being best united by the large enterprises; it is easier for it than for all others to elect and exercise control over those elected. The Soviet form of organisation automatically *helps* to unite all the working and exploited people around their vanguard, the proletariat.

*The Proletarian Revolution and the
Renegade Kautsky*, Vol. 28, p. 247

~
My dear learned historian and politician! It would not harm you to know that "opposition" is a concept that belongs to the peaceful and only to the parliamentary struggle, i.e., a concept that corresponds to a non-revolutionary situation, a concept that corresponds to an *absence of revolution*. During revolution we have to deal with a ruthless enemy in civil war; and no reactionary jeremiads of a petty bourgeois who fears such a war, as Kautsky does, will alter the fact.

*The Proletarian Revolution and the
Renegade Kautsky*, Vol. 28, p. 273

...The middle peasant ... is a peasant who does not exploit the labour of others, who does not live on the labour of others, who does not take the fruits of other people's labour in any shape or form, but works himself, and lives by his own labour.

The Middle Peasants, 5 records on
Gramophone Records, Vol. 29, p. 246

If we translate the Latin, scientific, historico-philosophical term "dictatorship of the proletariat" into simpler language, it means just the following:

Only a definite class, namely, the urban workers and the factory, industrial workers in general, is able to lead the whole mass of the working and exploited people in the struggle to throw off the yoke of capital, in actually carrying it out, in the struggle to maintain and consolidate the victory, in the work of creating the new, socialist social system and in the entire struggle for the complete abolition of classes. (Let us observe in parenthesis that the only scientific distinction

between socialism and communism is that the first term implies the first stage of the new society arising out of capitalism, while the second implies the next and higher stage.)

The mistake the "Berne" yellow International¹⁸¹ makes is that its leaders accept the class struggle and the leading role of the proletariat only in word and are afraid to think it out to its logical conclusion. They are afraid of that inevitable conclusion which particularly terrifies the bourgeoisie, and which is absolutely unacceptable to them.

A Great Beginning, Heroism of the Workers in the Rear, "Communist Subbotniks", Vol. 29, p. 120

...Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy.

A Great Beginning, Heroism of the Workers in the Rear, "Communist Subbotniks", Vol. 29, p. 121

To make this clearer to you, I shall quote an example. We call ourselves Communists. What is a Communist? Communist is a Latin word. Communis is the Latin for "common". Communist society is a society in which all things—the land, the factories—are owned in common and the people work in common. That is communism.

The Tasks of the Youth League, Vol. 31, pp. 295-96

...Communism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country, since the industry cannot be developed without electrification....

Our Foreign and Domestic Position and the Tasks of the Party, Speech Delivered to the Moscow Gubernia Conference of the R.C.P.(B.), Vol. 31, p. 419

Take this famous "industrial democracy", which Comrade

Bukharin hastened to insert in the Central Committee's resolution of December 7. It would, of course, be ridiculous to quibble about this ill-conceived brainchild ("tricky flourishes"), if it merely occurred in an article or speech. But, after all, it was Trotsky and Bukharin who put themselves into the ridiculous position by *insisting in their theses*¹⁸² on this very term, which is the one feature that distinguishes their "platforms" from Rudzutak's theses adopted by the trade unions.

The term is theoretically wrong. In the final analysis, every kind of democracy, as political superstructure in general (which must exist until classes have been abolished and a classless society established), serves production and is ultimately determined by the relations of production in a given society. It is, therefore, meaningless to single out "industrial democracy", for this leads to confusion, and the result is a dummy. That is the first point.

The second is that if you look at Bukharin's own explanation given in the resolution of the C.C. Plenary Meeting on December 7, which he drafted, you will find that he says: "Accordingly, the methods of workers' democracy must be those of industrial democracy, which means...." Note the "which means"! The fact is that Bukharin opens his appeal to the masses with such an outlandish term that he must *give a gloss on it*. This, I think, is *undemocratic* from the democratic standpoint. You must write for the masses without using terms that require a glossary. This is bad from the "production" standpoint because time is wasted in explaining unnecessary terms. "Which means," he says, "that nomination and seconding of candidates, elections, etc., must proceed with an eye not only to their political staunchness, but also business efficiency, administrative experience, leadership, and proved concern for the working people's material and spiritual interests."

The reasoning there is obviously artificial and incorrect. For one thing, democracy is more than "nomination and seconding of candidates, elections, etc." Then, again, not all elections should be held with an eye to political staunchness and business efficiency. Comrade Trotsky notwithstanding, an organisation of many millions must have a certain percentage of canvassers and bureaucrats (we shall not be able to make do without good bureaucrats for many years to

come). But we do not speak of "canvassing" or "bureaucratic" democracy.

The third point is that it is wrong to consider only the elected, the organisers, the administrators, etc. After all, they constitute a minority of outstanding men. It is the mass, the rank and file that we must consider. Rudzutak has it in simpler, more intelligible and theoretically more correct terms (thesis 6):

"... it must be brought home to each participant in production that his production tasks are appropriate and important; that each must not only take a hand in fulfilling his assignments, but also play an intelligent part in correcting any technical and organisational defects in the sphere of production."

The fourth point is that "industrial democracy" is a term that lends itself to misinterpretation. It may be read as a repudiation of dictatorship and individual authority. It may be read as a suspension of ordinary democracy or a pretext for evading it. Both readings are harmful, and cannot be avoided without long special commentaries.

Rudzutak's plain statement of the same ideas is more correct and more handy. This is indirectly confirmed by Trotsky's parallel of "war democracy" which he draws with his own term in an article, "Industrial Democracy", in *Pravda* of January 11, and which fails to refute that his term is inaccurate and inconvenient (for he side-steps the whole issue and fails to compare his theses with Rudzutak's). Happily, as far as I can recall, we have never had any factional controversy over that kind of them.

Trotsky's "production atmosphere" is even wider of the mark, and Zinoviev had good reason to laugh at it. This made Trotsky very angry, and he came out with this argument: "We once had a war atmosphere.... We must now have a production atmosphere and not only on the surface but deep down in the workers' mass. This must be as intense and practical an interest in production as was earlier displayed in the fronts...." Well, there you are: the message must be carried "deep down into the workers' mass" in the language of Rudzutak's theses, because "production atmosphere" will only earn you a smile or a shrug. Comrade Trotsky's "production atmosphere" has essentially the same meaning as production propaganda, but such expressions must be avoided when production propaganda is addressed

to the workers at large. The term is an example of how *not* to carry it on among the masses.

Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin, Vol. 32, p. 81-83

...That is no exaggeration: I have carefully weighed my words. A deviation is not yet a full-blown trend. A deviation is something that can be rectified. People have somewhat strayed or are beginning to stray from the path, but can still be put right. That, in my opinion, is what the Russian word *uklon* means. It emphasises that there is nothing final in it as yet, and that the matter can be easily rectified; it shows a desire to sound a warning and to raise the question on principle in all its scope. If anyone has a better word to express this idea, let us have it, by all means.

Report on Party Unity and the Anarcho-Syndicalist Deviation, March 16, Tenth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), Vol. 32, p. 251-52

What is a concession? It is a contract between the government and a capitalist who undertakes to organise or improve production (for example, felling and floating timber, extracting coal, oil, ore, etc.) and to pay the government a share of the product obtained, keeping the rest as his profit.

Concessions and the Development of Capitalism, Vol. 32, p. 368

Consumers' co-operative societies are associations of workers and peasants for the purpose of supplying and distributing the goods they need. Producers' co-operative societies are associations of small farmers or artisans for the purpose of producing and marketing products, whether agricultural (such as vegetables, dairy produce and the like) or non-agricultural (all sorts of manufactured goods, woodwork, ironware, leather goods, and so forth).

Consumers' and Producers' Co-operative Societies, Vol. 32, p. 370

In Russia at that time there was a trend that we called Economism. By this rather slangy term we meant the childish vulgarisation of Marx's views on historical materialism.

Interview with Arthur Ransome, "Manchester Guardian" Correspondent, Vol. 33, p. 400

VI. ON STYLE AND NORMS OF LANGUAGE

"What is transmitted by inheritance," argues Mr. Mikhailovsky, "is the products of economic production" ("the products of economic production"!! How literate! How sonorous! What elegant language!) "and the very institution of inheritance is to a certain degree determined by the fact of economic competition. But, firstly, non-material values are also transmitted by inheritance—as expressed in the concern to bring up children in the spirit of their fathers." So the upbringing of children is part of the institution of inheritance! The Russian Civil Code, for example, contains a clause saying that "parents must endeavour by home upbringing to train their" (i.e., their children's) "morals and to further the aims of government." Is this what our philosopher calls the institution of inheritance?—"and, secondly, even confining ourselves solely to the economic sphere, if the institution of inheritance is inconceivable without the products of production transmitted by inheritance, it is just as unthinkable without the products of 'procreation,' without them and without that complex and intense psychology which directly adheres to them." (Do pay attention to the language: a complex psychology "adheres to" the products of procreation! That is really exquisite!)

*What the "Friends of the People" Are and
How They Fight the Social-Democrats,
Vol. 1, p. 152*

...Another peculiarity of Mr. Mikhailovsky's is that he concentrated all his attention on the use of tenses. Why, when he speaks of the future, does Marx use the present tense?—our philosopher demands with an air of triumph. You may find the answer to this in any grammar, most worthy critic: you will find that the present tense is used

instead of the future when the future is regarded as inevitable and undoubted.

What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats,
Vol. 1, p. 174

To employ "bugbears" and "terrible words" means describing an opponent in terms of severe disapproval that at the same time are not clearly and precisely motivated and do not follow inevitably from the writer's standpoint (one that has been definitely stated), but simply express a desire to abuse, to dress down.

Obviously, it is only this last feature which turns epithets of severe disapproval into "bugbears."

What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats,
Vol. 1, p. 323

As the reader sees, I have only to round off Mr. Struve's¹⁸³ propositions, to formulate them in another way, "to say the same thing, only differently."

The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book,
Vol. 1, p. 434

We have now acquainted ourselves with our fines laws and regulations, with all this exceptionally complicated system that frightens the worker away with its dryness and unattractive official language.

Explanation of the Law of Fines Imposed on Factory Workers, Vol. 2, p. 69

...Of all articles in the book, the most practical one is that on the textbooks used in our gymnasia.¹⁸⁴ The author goes into a detailed examination of the current textbooks of the Russian language, geography and history, and demonstrates their utter worthlessness. This article would make the more interesting reading if it, too, were not made irksome by the author's usual verbosity....

Gems of Narodnik Project-Mongering,
Vol. 2, p. 461

...To describe Mr. Yuzhakov's "plan"¹⁸⁵ an even more complex term is required. It has to be called a *feudal-*

bureaucratic-bourgeois-socialist experiment. A rather clumsy, four-storeyed term—but what would you have? The plan itself is clumsy. But, on the other hand, this term *accurately* conveys all the characteristic features of Mr. Yuzhakov's "utopia"....

Gems of Narodnik Project-Mongering,
Vol. 2, p. 480

The style of the book suffers, at times, from mannerisms and haziness.

Review of Guosdev's Book, Vol. 4, p. 69

Kautsky's fault is his bad habit (possessed by many of the narrow orthodox) of never forgetting that members of a militant socialist party must, even in their scientific works, keep the working-class reader in mind, that they must strive to write *simply*, without employing unnecessary clever turns of phrase and those outer symptoms of "learning" which so captivate decadents and the titled representatives of official science. In this work, too, Kautsky preferred to relate in a clear and simple manner the latest discoveries in agronomics and to omit scientific names that mean nothing to nine-tenths of the readers. The Voroshilovs, however, act in precisely the opposite manner; they prefer to effuse a veritable stream of scientific names in the domains of agronomics, political economy, critical philosophy, etc., and thus bury essentials under this scientific lumber.

The Agrarian Question and the "Critics of Marx", Vol. 5, p. 152

If one has the patience to read through Mr. Sipyagin's circular to the end, we said. A great deal of patience will be required, for three-fourths, nay, nine-tenths of the circular consists of the usual official banalities. It is a rehash of things known for years and repeated a hundred times even in the "Code of Laws". It is a mass of circumlocution, a detailed description of the ceremonial in the relations between Chinese mandarins; it is in the grand style of the chancelleries, with periods thirty-six lines long, in a "jargon" that makes the heart bleed for our native Russian language. As you read deeply into this effusion, you feel as though you were in a Russian police-station with its musty walls and its all-pervading specific stench, in which the officials personify

in their appearance and bearing the most case-hardened bureaucracy, while in the courtyard, visible through the window, gloomy building loom reminiscent of the torture chamber.

Fighting the Famine-Stricken, Vol. 5,
pp. 231-32

But greater stringency, intensified surveillance—all this demands increased expenditure on the bureaucratic machine, a fact of which the Minister has not lost sight; the uyezd marshals of the nobility, or other persons directing the Central Uyezd Food Board, will be granted “a special sum” to cover their expenses, “concerning the approximate amount where of Your Excellency will tender the appropriate application to me”, adds the circular in its “special” jargon.

Fighting the Famine-Stricken, Vol. 5,
pp. 233-34

PLEKHANOV'S TEXT

I. The principal economic feature of present-day society is the domination of capitalist production relations in it, ..

LENIN'S NOTES

Page 1.

No. 1—Capitalism is not a “feature” of present-day society, but its economic system or mode, etc.

Material for the Preparation of the Programme of the R.S.D.L.P. Notes on Plekhanov's First Draft Programme, Vol. 6, p. 19

The *entire character* of the programme is, in my opinion, the most general and basic defect of this draft, one that makes it unacceptable. Specifically, it is not the programme of a party engaged in a practical struggle, but a *Prinzipienerklärung**; it is rather a programme for students (especially its most important section, which is devoted to a definition of capitalism), moreover for first-year students, who are acquainted with capitalism in general, but not yet with Russian capitalism. This basic defect leads also to a great deal of repetition, and the *programme* tends to become a *commentary*.

* A declaration of principles.—*Ed.*

I shall endeavour to prove this by analysing the draft point by point, and shall then draw the general conclusions.

"The development of international exchange", etc., to the words "has long become an international movement" (§ I—for convenience in quoting I shall number each paragraph in consecutive order).

In essence there is nothing to which objection can be taken here. Only the words: "the great emancipation movement of our times" are superfluous, for the emancipatory nature of the working-class movement is dealt with below at length and concretely.

Further, in my opinion, this paragraph is not in its proper place. The programme of the Russian Social-Democratic Party should begin with a definition (and indictment) of Russian capitalism—and only then stress the international character of the movement, which in form—to use the words of the *Communist Manifesto*—is of necessity at first a national struggle.

§ II. "*Like the Social-Democrats of all other countries, the Russian Social-Democrats take an international stand. They regard their Party as one of the detachments of the world army of the proletariat, as part of international Social-Democracy.*"

The words I have underlined are superfluous, since they add absolutely nothing to what has been said prior to and after this. These superfluous words merely weaken the wholly adequate and graphic expression of thought contained in the words "detachment" and "part".

§ III. "They pursue the same ultimate aim as the Social-Democrats of all other countries."

These too are superfluous words, repeated *twice* below in §§ XIII ("the ultimate aim of all the efforts of international Social-Democracy", etc.) and XVII ("the identity of the common ultimate aim"). A "detachment" of an army is a detachment for the very reason that it pursues the same aim.

§ IV. "This ultimate aim, which is common to the Social-Democrats of all countries" (again superfluous repetition), "is determined by bourgeois society's nature and course of development."

Also superfluous words, precisely because it is shown further *how* bourgeois society's nature and course of development "determine" this ultimate aim. This paragraph

is something in the nature of a heading or section title. But headings, which are necessary in textbooks or articles, are quite unnecessary in a programme. *Alles, was im Programm überflüssig, schwächt es** (Engels in his notes on the draft of the Erfurt Programme)¹⁸⁶....

No one will doubt that such processes as the differentiation of the peasantry, increasing use of machinery especially by big proprietors, improvements in the stock of draught animals used by the big proprietors and deterioration of that used by smallholders (the substitution of cows for horses, etc.), growing "importunities" of the hired worker at the big enterprises and the longer working hours there, *resp.* the small peasant's diminishing consumption, improved cultivation and fertilisation of the big proprietor's land, and poorer cultivation and fertilisation of the smallholder's land, the big proprietor's advantage over the latter in the field of credits and association, and so on and so forth—all these are precisely an *ousting* of small-scale production by large-scale production (in agriculture). It is not at all difficult (or even necessary) to prove that all these processes amount to "ousting"—it is difficult to prove that it is *precisely* to these processes that attention should be paid that these processes are actually *taking place*. This difficulty is not made easier in the least by the words: "an increase in the importance and the reduction of the role"; it can be made easier *only* by a commentary, *only* by examples of how people *are unable to define* (do not want to define) the true expression of the process of ousting (=an increase in the importance and the reduction of the role).

It is a sheer illusion to imagine that the words "an increase in the importance and the reduction of the role" are deeper, more meaningful, and broader than the "narrow" and "stereotyped" word "ousting". These words do not contribute in the least towards a more profound understanding of the process—they merely express this process *more hazily and more vaguely*. And the reason I am contesting these words so vigorously is not because they are theoretically incorrect, but just because they lend an appearance of profundity to *sheer haziness*.

* All that is superfluous in a programme weakens it.—Ed.

A person who has "attended a seminary" and nothing more and is aware that a proportionate decrease (and not necessarily an absolute decrease) is tantamount to ousting will see in this haziness a desire to cover up the nakedness of the "Marxist dogma", which has been compromised by the critics.* A person who has not attended a seminary will only sigh over such masterly and "fathomless wisdom"—whereas the word "ousting" will remind every worker and every peasant of scores and hundreds of familiar instances. It is no harm if he does not immediately grasp the full import of this expression: *selbst wenn einmal ein Fremdwort oder ein nicht auf den ersten Blick in seiner ganzen Tragweite zu erfassender Satz vorkommt, schadet das nichts. Der mündliche Vortrag in den Versammlungen, die schriftliche Erklärung in der Presse tut da alles Nötige, und der kurze, prägnante Satz befestigt sich dann, einmal verstanden, im Gedächtniss, wird Schlagwort, und das passiert der breiteren Auseinandersetzung nie.*** (Engels in his criticism of the Erfurt Draft.)

From the standpoint of style, too, the words "an increase in the importance and the reduction of the role" instead of "ousting" are undesirable. This is not the language of a revolutionary party, but the language of *Russkiye Vedomosti*.¹⁸⁷ This is the terminology not of socialist propaganda, but of a statistical abstract. These words seem, as it were, deliberately chosen with a view to giving the reader the impression that the process described is a mild one, culminating in nothing definite, a painless process. Since in reality the reverse is true, these words are *to that extent* quite wrong. We cannot and should not choose the *most abstract* formulations, for what we are writing is not an article directed against the critics, but the programme of a militant party, which makes its appeal to the masses of handicraftsmen and peasants. In

* Such an *interpretation* of haziness is all the more inevitable the more widely such a definite formulation as, for instance, in the Erfurt Programme, becomes known: "...geht die Verdrängung der zersplitterten Kleinbetriebe durch kolossale Grossbetriebe...." ("...the scattered small enterprises are being ousted by colossal large-scale enterprises...."—Ed.).

** There is no harm in one's occasionally coming across a foreign word or a sentence whose full import one cannot grasp at first glance. Oral reports at meetings and written statements in the press do all that is necessary, and a brief but pithy sentence, once understood, will impress itself on the mind and become a slogan, which is never the case with a broader exposition.—Ed.

this appeal, we must say *klipp und klar** that capital "makes servants and tributaries of them", "ruins" them and "ousts" them, driving them into the ranks of the proletariat. This is the only formulation that would be a true expression of what every handicraftsman and every peasant knows from thousands of instances. And only this formulation will *inevitably* suggest the conclusion: your only salvation lies in joining the party of the proletariat....

...Dependent "more or less completely, more or less obviously, more or less onerously..."—these are words which, in my opinion, are redundant and *weaken* the meaning. The phrasing in the original draft—"servants and tributaries"—is stronger and more graphic....

Summing up all the above notes, I find four basic shortcomings in the draft, which, in my opinion, render it unacceptable:

1) extreme *abstractness* of many of the formulations, so that they might seem intended for a series of lectures rather than for a militant party;

2) evasion and obscuring of the question of specifically *Russian capitalism* are a particularly serious shortcoming, since the programme should provide a compendium and guide for agitation against Russian capitalism. We must come out with a direct appraisal of Russian capitalism and with an open declaration of war against it specifically;

3) the altogether one-sided and incorrect presentation of the *relation of the proletariat to the small producers*, which cuts the ground from under our feet in the war against the "critics" and many others;

4) the constant endeavour in the programme to give *explanations* of the process. The explanations fail in their purpose anyway, and the exposition becomes prolix, numerous repetitions occur, and the programme constantly lapses into a commentary.

Notes on Plekhanov's Second Draft Programme,¹⁸⁸ Vol. 6, p. 35-36, 40-42, 44, 55

* Clearly and distinctly.—Ed.

Four basic shortcomings pervade the whole draft¹⁸⁹ and, in my opinion, make it entirely unacceptable:

1) In the manner of formulation of the most important section, which contains a definition of capitalism, this draft is a programme of an economic *textbook* on capitalism in general rather than a programme for the proletariat, which is *fighting* against very real manifestations of a very definite capitalism.

2) The programme is particularly unsuitable for the party of the *Russian* proletariat, because the evolution of Russian capitalism and the antagonisms and social evils engendered by Russian capitalism are almost entirely evaded and obscured by the selfsame system of defining capitalism in general. In its programme the party of the Russian proletariat should formulate in the most unambiguous manner its arraignment of Russian capitalism, its declaration of war on Russian capitalism. This is all the more necessary inasmuch as the Russian programme cannot be identical in this respect with the European programmes: the latter speak of capitalism and of bourgeois society without indicating that these concepts are equally applicable to Austria, Germany, and so on, because that goes without saying. In relation to Russia this cannot be taken for granted.

To dispense with the question by saying that capitalism "in its developed form" is distinguished *in general* by such and such features—and in Russia capitalism "is becoming predominant"—is to *evade* making the concrete arraignment and declaration of war that is most important for a party engaged in a practical struggle.

That is why the draft fails to achieve one of the principal aims of a programme: to provide the Party with a directive for its day-by-day propaganda and agitation concerning all the various manifestations of Russian capitalism.

3) Some of the most important paragraphs are formulated in the draft with an inaccuracy which will inevitably engender most dangerous misinterpretations and hamper our theoretical struggle and propaganda. Thus, for example, the growth of large-scale production is limited to "industrial" enterprises. The evolution of agrarian capitalism is disregarded or even evaded. Further, instead of "the dictatorship

of the proletariat" there is "the revolution which the proletariat will have to effect with the support of other sections of the population which are suffering from capitalist exploitation", and even the class struggle of the proletariat has been replaced by "the struggle of the working and exploited masses". This formulation contradicts the basic principle of the International: "The emancipation of the workers must be the act of the working class itself." Besides the proletariat, the other part of the "working and exploited masses" (i. e., mainly the small producers) is *only partially* revolutionary in its struggle against the bourgeoisie. It is revolutionary only when, "with a view to joining the proletariat", it "*places itself at the standpoint of the proletariat*" (*The Communist Manifesto*). As for the reactionary nature of the small producers, that is not brought out in the draft, so that *on the whole* the relation of the proletariat to the "working and exploited masses" is presented *incorrectly*. (For example, the draft reads: "their struggle [the struggle of the working and exploited masses] and, above all, the struggle of their foremost representative, the proletariat, is becoming sharper." "The sharpening of the struggle" of the small producers is expressed in anti-Semitism, in Caesarism, in peasant unions against the farm labourers, and even in the struggle of the socialist Gironde against the Mountain.¹⁹⁰ Representation of all the working and exploited masses by the proletariat should be expressed in the programme in our *arraignment* of capitalism for the poverty of the *masses* [and not only for the poverty of the working class], for unemployment among "ever wider sections of the working population" [and not of the working class].)

4) The draft constantly slips away from a programme in the strict sense of the word towards a *commentary*. A programme should give *concise statements*, without a single superfluous word, and leave all *explanations* to commentaries, pamphlets, agitation, etc. Engels was therefore fully justified when he accused the Erfurt Programme of being too long, abounding in too much detail and repetition, so as to tend towards becoming a commentary.

In the draft this shortcoming is still more manifest; there is a dreadful amount of repetition; in any case, the attempts made to introduce *explanations* of the process into the programme (instead of merely giving a *definition* of the

process) fail to achieve their purpose and render the programme impossibly prolix.

Vol. 6, pp. 56-58

TEXT OF THE COMMITTEE
DRAFT ¹⁹¹

LENIN'S REMARKS

2. For this reason the Russian Social-Democrats regard their Party as one of the detachments of the world army of the proletariat, as part of international Social-Democracy, and pursue the same ultimate aim as the Social-Democrats of all other countries.

The style needs brushing up.

This "as" is not good Russian. Clumsy style. "They pursue the same ultimate aim as the Social-Democrats of all other countries have set themselves", or something to that effect.

3. This ultimate aim is determined by bourgeois society's nature and course of development.

I would recommend that "nature and" be deleted as superfluous words. The *ultimate aim* is determined by the *course* and not by the modifications of this general "course" that are explained by the concept of "nature of development". Hence, these superfluous words are also not quite accurate.

This society is characterised by the domination of commodity production under capitalist production relations, i. e., by the fact that the most important and most considerable part of the articles of consumption is produced

Why only "articles of consumption"? What about means of production? "Products", etc., would be bett-

for sale on the home or world
market and the most important
and most considerable part of the
means

of production and of circulation
of these articles of consumption—
commodities —

belongs to a relatively small

class of persons. V where is the
overwhelming majority of the
population consists partly of per-
sons who possess no means of
production

and of circulation whatever (pro-
ducts)

and partly of those who have at
their disposal only very insignifi-
cant means of production which
do not ensure their existence (cer-
tain sections of small producers
as for instance small peasants
and handicraftsmen). All these

These words should, in
my opinion, be deleted
Unnecessary repetition

These words should be
deleted. Commodities are
not limited to articles of
consumption

(Instead of "relatively
small *perhaps negligible*,
since the words *most im-*
portant and most consider-
able part are sufficiently
restrictive. But this is not
important')

V The words "to the
capitalists and landowners"
should be added. Other-
wise the result is an *abstract*
concept which is particularly
out of place in conjunction
with the subsequent 'peas-
ants and handicraftsmen'

And 'of circulation'
should be deleted. Pro-
letarians of the purest
water can have and do
have means of circula-
tion which are exchanged
for *articles of consump-*
tion

The style requires brush-
ing up'

"Means of production"
ensure (✓) existence

persons are forced by their economic position to sell their labour-power *constantly* or *periodically*, i. e., to hire themselves to the owners of the means of production and of circulation of commodities, and by their labour create the latter's income.

4. The domination of capitalist production relations grows more and more as constant technical progress, by increasing the economic importance of the big enterprises, ousts the independent small producers, that is, causes a relative decline in their number by converting part of them into proletarians, diminishes the role of the others in social and economic life, and at places makes them more or less completely, more or less obviously, more or less one-rously, dependent upon the big manufacturers.

5. By converting part of the independent small producers into proletarians, this technical progress leads to a still greater increase in the supply of labour-power, making it possible for the manufacturers to employ female and child labour to an ever greater extent in the process of commodity production and circulation. And since, on the other hand, this same process of technical (machine) progress leads to a relative decrease in the manufacturers' need of the workers' physical labour, the demand for labour-power necessarily lags behind its supply, as a consequence of which the dependence of wage-labour on capital increases and the exploitation of the former by capital is intensified. The share of the working class in the sum-total of the social income created by its labour is constantly diminishing.)

“Upon capital”—not only upon big capital.

These words should be deleted as a needless repetition of the idea already

expressed in the preceding proposition

In general, § 5 brings out in particular relief the general defect of the draft *long periods* and an undesirable *proximity* of exposition. Incidentally this results in what Engels in his criticism of the Erfurt Draft called "*schiefe Nebenbedeutung*"* For instance, it appears as if the increase in the employment of female and child labour is due *solely* to the "conversion" of the independent small producers into proletarians, whereas this is not so, it also takes place *prior to* such "*conversion*". The beginning of § 5 is a superfluous repetition

9) This social revolution will consist in the *removal* of capitalist production relations and their substitution by socialist production relations i.e. it will consist in the expropriation of the exploiters for the purpose of converting the means of production and of circulation of products into public property and in the planned organisation of the social production process so as to satisfy the needs of both society as a whole and its individual members

Not accurate. Such "satisfaction" is "given" by capitalism as well, but *not to all* members of society and *not in equal degree*

*The possibility of misinterpretation — Ed

The achievement of this aim will emancipate all of oppressed humanity, since it will put an end to all forms of the exploitation of one part of society by another.

10. To effect its social revolution, the proletariat must win political power (the class dictatorship), which will make it master of the situation and enable it to surmount all obstacles. Organising for this purpose into an independent political party, which is opposed to all bourgeois parties,

the proletariat calls upon all other sections of the population which are suffering from capitalist exploitation to join its ranks,

counting on their support, inasmuch as they are conscious of the hopelessness of their position in present-day society and place themselves at the standpoint of the proletariat.

— My objections have already been set forth—N.B.

?
“Opposed to *all* bourgeois parties” means to the *petty-bourgeois* parties as well, does it not?? But the *majority* of the petty bourgeois are “working and exploited”. That does not hang together.

Social-Democracy organises and calls upon. “The proletariat ... calls into its (!) sections”—*ganz unmöglich!* *

The words “counting on their support” should be deleted. They are *redundant* (if it calls upon, that means it counts on) and have *schiefe Nebenbedeutung*. It calls upon those who are conscious, inasmuch as they are conscious, *das genügt*. **

* Quite impossible!—The reference is to an infelicity in the Russian style.—*Ed.*

** That is enough.—*Ed.*

12. But despite the identity of their common ultimate aim, an identity conditioned by the dominance of the same mode of production throughout the civilised world, the Social-Democrats of different countries do not set themselves the same *immediate* tasks both because this mode is not everywhere developed in equal degree and also because its development in different countries takes place under varying social and political conditions

13. In Russia, side by side with capitalism, which is rapidly extending the sphere of its domination and more and more becoming the predominant mode of production, we still meet at every step remnants of our old, pre-capitalist social order, which was based on bondage of the masses of working people to the landlords, to the state, or to the head of the state. These remnants retard the development of the productive forces in the highest degree, hamper the allround development of the proletariat's class struggle, lower the working population's standard of living, are responsible for the Asiatically barbarous way in which the many-million-strong peasantry is being ruined and reduced to degradation and keep entire people in a state of ignor-

2 Style!!

§ 12—the end. An attempt should be made to shorten this. It would be very useful for this paragraph to shrink. Would it not be possible to condense ten words into two by saying “national features”, or a similar expression?

§ 13—the beginning. My most humble thanks for the tiny step in my direction. But “becoming the predominant” *

N.B

2 Style!

§ 13—the end. Correction desirable. I have al-

* At this point Lenin expresses his opinion — a piece of infelicitous phrasing in the draft — *Fd*

ance, total absence of rights, and subjection.

14. As the most outstanding of all survivals of our serf-owning system and the most formidable bulwark of all this barbarism, the tsarist autocracy is wholly incompatible with political and civil liberties, which have long been in existence in the advanced countries of capitalist production, as the natural legal complement to that production.

By its very nature it must crush every social movement and is

ready suggested *how* (my amendments to my draft), or you get "...barbarous way in which... is being ruined and reduced to degradation..."?

? Style

"*Natural* legal complement"—a correct thought very badly expressed. For capitalism the "naturalness" of liberty is complicated by 1,001 social and historical factors, which the word "natural" does not bring out. Moreover, it smacks, reeks, of a sort of liberalism. Something should be said to the effect that the "autocracy is *inevitably* doomed to death by the *entire* development of capitalism, which imperatively requires civil and political liberties for the expression of its increasingly complex interests", or something like that, in short, the idea of *inevitability* should be expressed, without giving rise to misunderstandings by attributing this inevitability to "natural" developments.

? This won't do. *Not* every: bimetalism) (and pre-

bound to be the bitterest enemy of all the proletariat's emancipatory aspirations.

For these reasons, Russian Social-Democracy advances as its immediate political task the overthrow of the tsarist autocracy and its replacement by a republic based on a democratic constitution that would ensure, etc.

Raphaelitism¹⁹²) are also "social movements". This must be amended.

Remarks on the Committee's Draft Programme, Vol. 6, pp. 59-62, 66-70

Besides my remarks written on the draft itself, I should like to note the following:

§ 3. "Society (bourgeois) is characterised by the domination of commodity production *under* capitalist production relations, *i.e.*" ... then follows a description of the basic features of capitalism. The result is an incongruity: the "*i.e.*" connects dissimilar, unequal concepts, namely, 1) the *modification* of commodity production in a form conditioned by the domination of capitalist production relations, and 2) the sale of products on the market and the sale of their labour-power by the masses of the population.

This incongruity, this equating of the *basic* and most general features of commodity production in general and of capitalism in general—and the modifications of commodity production on the basis of capitalist production relations (then commodities are no longer exchanged *simply* according to value)—clearly shows how poor G. V. Plekhanov's formulation is (and yet the committee adopted this formulation, merely rephrasing it). In a programme that presents only the most general and basic features of capitalism *and does not set forth even the theory of surplus-value*, we suddenly "nod" to Böhm-Bawerk by calling to mind that "commodity production on the basis of capitalism" is not quite the same as simple commodity production! If so, then why not add to the programme special references to Mikhailovsky, Berdayev, and the like? On the one hand, only one very general socialist expression is used to cover even all of Marx's

teachings about the exploitation of labour by capital: "create by their labour the latter's income" (end of § 3)—and on the other hand, note is made of the specific transformation of surplus-value into profit under "commodity production on the basis of capitalist production relations".

G. V. Plekhanov is quite right when he states that the words "commodity production on the basis of capitalist production relations" express the fundamental idea of Volume III. But that is all. There is no point in including this idea in the programme—just as there is no point in describing in the programme the mechanism of realisation, which is the fundamental idea of Volume II,¹⁹³ or in describing the conversion of excess profit into ground rent. In the programme it is sufficient to *note* the exploitation of labour by capital—the creation of surplus-value, whereas to speak of every kind of *transformation* and modification of the forms of surplus-value is out of place (and impossible in a few short propositions).

*Additional Remarks on the Committee's
Draft Programme, Vol. 6, pp. 72-73*

Plekhanov. This is the first time I see the word *antagonism* used in the *plural*.

The author of the remarks should not imagine that he is past seeing anything for the first time.

Replies to Plekhanov's and Axelrod's Remarks on the Article "The Agrarian Programme of Russian Social-Democracy, Vol. 41, p. 68

...It would be better to worry less about the author of a signed article *expressing* himself in his own manner.

Replies to Plekhanov's and Axelrod's Remarks on the Article "The Agrarian Programme of Russian Social-Democracy", Vol. 41, p. 64

...In his defence of the old mainstays of "economism", Comrade Akimov even advanced such an incredibly eccentric argument as that the word proletariat does not figure in our programme even once in the nominative case. At most, Comrade Akimov exclaimed, they have the proletariat in the genitive case. And so it appears that the nominative is the most honourable case, whereas the genitive takes second

place in the scale of honour. It only remains to convey this idea—through a special commission, perhaps—to Comrade Ryazanov, so as to enable him to supplement his first scientific work on the letters of the alphabet with another treatise on the cases....

Speech on the Party Programme, July 22 (August 4), Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., Vol. 6, p. 488

The word “militia” does not say anything new and makes for confusion. The words “universal arming of the people” are clear and quite Russian. I find Comrade Lieber’s amendment superfluous.

Speech in the Debate on the General Political Demands of the Party Programme, Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., Vol. 41, p. 87

...Can it really be that street meetings (in Odessa, as well as those previously held in Rostov-on-Don and other cities) are less likely to develop a sense of political competence and the right to put forth demands than meetings in municipal councils?... True, I must admit that I feel rather uncomfortable in quoting this last expression (the right to *put forth demands*); it is so stupid. But you can’t throw the words out of a song.

Good Demonstrations of Proletarians and Poor Arguments of Certain Intellectuals, Vol. 8, p. 32

...This is not the language of political leaders, but of archive fogeys....

Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, Vol. 9, p. 41

Take the expression “the final abolition of the whole regime of the monarchy and the social estates”. In plain language the final abolition of the monarchist system means the establishment of a democratic republic. But our good Martynov and his admirers think that this expression is far too clear and simple. They insist on making it “deeper” and putting it more “cleverly”. As a result, we get, on the one hand, ridiculous and vain efforts to appear profound; on the

other hand, we get a description instead of a slogan, a kind of melancholy retrospection instead of a stirring appeal to march forward. We get the impression not of living people eager to fight for a republic here and now, but of so many withered mummies who, *sub specie aeternitatis*,* consider the question from the *plusquamperfectum* viewpoint.

Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, Vol. 9, p. 42

...The discussion¹⁹⁴ then spread to the whole political press in Russia, both the free (i.e., illegal) press which gave frank and full expression to all its arguments and slogans, and to the legal press, which wrote in Aesopian language for a boycott, and openly against it.

The First Results of the Political Alignment, Vol. 9, p. 397

...I remember only one episode in which, perhaps, the "Parvusites"¹⁹⁵ among the Mensheviks made them all slightly change their attitude. It was an incident over the question of armed uprising. Plekhanov, the chairman of the committee, had altered the original Menshevik resolution, and instead of "wrest power" (this part of the resolution concerned the aims of the movement) inserted "wrest rights by force" (or "capture rights"—I don't quite remember which). The opportunism of this alteration was so glaring that the most heated protests were raised against it in open Congress. We attacked the alteration with redoubled vigour. The ranks of the Mensheviks wavered. I do not know exactly whether any factional meetings had been held, or what took place at them if they were; nor can I vouch for the truth of the statement made to me that ten Mensheviks who were inclined towards "Parvusism" had emphatically declared their disagreement with the alteration. The fact is that, after the debates in open Congress, Plekhanov himself withdrew the alteration and did not allow it to be put to a vote; did this on the pretext (a skilful piece of diplomacy, perhaps, but it raised a smile) that it was not worth arguing about questions of "style".

Report on the Unity Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., Vol. 10, p. 324

* From the viewpoint of eternity (Latin).—Ed.

...In the original draft of the Menshevik resolution on the State Duma proposed by the committee, Clause 5 (on the armed forces) contained the following sentence: ... "Seeing for the first time on Russian soil a new authority, sprung from the depths of the nation, *called into being by the tsar himself and recognised by the law*", etc. In criticising the Menshevik resolution for what may mildly be called its imprudent and optimistic attitude towards the State Duma, I also criticised the words I have underlined, and said jestingly: should we not add "and sent by God's grace" (meaning authority)? Comrade Plekhanov, a member of the committee, was frightfully angry with me for cracking this joke. What, he exclaimed in his speech, must I listen to this "suspicions of being an opportunist"? (His exact words, as I wrote them down.) I have served in the army myself, and I know the military man's attitude towards authority; I know of the importance he attaches to authority recognised by the tsar, etc., etc. Comrade Plekhanov's resentment exposed his vulnerable spot, and showed still more clearly that he had "overdone it". In my speech in reply to the debate, I said that it was not a matter of "suspicions", and it was ridiculous to use such pitiful expressions. Nobody was accusing Plekhanov of believing in the tsar. But resolutions are not written for Plekhanov; they are written for the people. And it was indecent to disseminate among the people such ambiguous arguments, fit only for Messrs. Witte and Co. These arguments would turn against us, for if we stressed that the State Duma was an "authority" (?? this work alone reveals the excessive optimism of our Mensheviks), and an authority called into being by the tsar, then it would be inferred that this lawful authority must act according to the law, and obey the one who "called it into being".

The Mensheviks themselves realised that Plekhanov had overdone it. On a motion that came from their ranks, the words underlined above were deleted from the resolution.

*Report on the Unity Congress of the
R.S.D.L.P., Vol. 10, pp 363-64*

But it would be ridiculously to propose such an appeal in the Duma.

But would it? Is it not more ridiculous to write "appeals to the people" in the stilted language of the hidebound Russian

lawyers that the Cadets¹⁹⁶ and (to their shame be it said) the Trudoviks¹⁹⁷ use?

A Bold Assault and a Timid Defence,
Vol. 11, pp. 99-100

Let us point out, too, that in the election campaign in general, and in concluding electoral agreements at the higher stages, the Social-Democrats must speak simply and clearly, in a language comprehensible to the masses, absolutely discarding the heavy artillery of erudite terms, foreign words and stock slogans, definitions and conclusions which are as yet unfamiliar and unintelligible to the masses. Without flamboyant phrases, without rhetoric, but with facts and figures, they must be able to *explain* the questions of socialism and of the present Russian revolution.

The Social Democrats and Electoral Agreements, Vol. 11, p. 294

Issue No. 13 of *Narodnaya Duma* published an endlessly long resolution on mass workers' organisations and a labour congress¹⁹⁸; the resolution is a draft for the forthcoming congress, compiled by a group of publicists and Mensheviks engaged in practical activities....

It falls into two parts—A and B. In the preamble to the first part there are endless platitudes on the benefit of the organisation and uniting of the mass of the workers. "For the sake of importance", as Bazarov said, organisation is converted into *self-organisation*. It is true that this word does not actually express anything or contain any definite idea, but it is nevertheless a favourite with the champions of the labour congress! There is no need to explain that this "self-organisation" is only an intellectualist device to cover up the dearth of real organisational ideas—it would never have entered the head of a worker to invent "self-organisation"....

The preamble criticises Social-Democracy for the "dominant and determining role played in it by the intelligentsia as compared to its proletarian elements"....

Larin, El and many other champions of the labour congress, give Social-Democracy a "dressing-down" for *forcing resolutions through*. And to drive such criticism home, the publicists "force through" long new, boring and cloying periods on "self-organisations".... What a picture!

The resolution notes the “ideological and *political* influence” of the Russian Social-Democratic Party (i.e., the R.S.D.L.P., or has a broader term been *deliberately* used to include Prokopovich, Kuskova, Posse and others?¹⁴⁹) on the advanced strata of the proletariat, and speaks of the desirability of “uniting the forces” of Russian Social-Democracy “with the *politically conscious elements of the proletariat*” (A, Point 6).

Try for once to *think over* the words you use to compile your phrases, comrades! Can there be a “politically conscious” proletarian who is *not a Social-Democrat*? If there cannot be, then your words boil down to empty tautology, to turgid and pretentious trivialities....

The outcome: In its conclusion the resolution said absolutely nothing on the essence of the matter. At best its conclusion is hollow phrase-mongering. At worst, it is harmful phrase-mongering, misleading to the proletariat, overshadowing the *ABC of Social-Democratic* truth, opening wide the door to any declassed bourgeois, such as those who have for a long time been doing considerable damage to the *Social-Democratic* working-class movement in all European countries.

How should the resolution be corrected?

The empty phrases should be discarded. It should be said simply that Social-Democracy must support the organisation of various workers' associations, for example, consumers' societies, with due and constant regard for every workers' association serving as a centre *precisely of Social-Democratic* propaganda, agitation and organisation.

That would, indeed, be a “politically modest” but *business-like* and *Social-Democratic* resolution. And you, gentlemen, you intellectualist warriors against the “dominant and determining role of the intelligentsia”, you have put forward not the proletarian cause, but intellectualist phrase-mongering.

Intellectualist Warriors Against Domination by the Intelligentsia, Vol. 12, pp. 316, 317, 319

...The Mensheviks' love of platitudinous phrases, their evasion of the *concrete* exposition of a question, is a purely

intellectualist trait. It is at root alien to the proletariat, and harmful from the standpoint of the proletariat.

Angry Embarrassment. The Question of the Labour Congress, Vol. 12, p. 321

What is impermissible in members of a united party is permissible and obligatory for sections of a party that has been split. It is wrong to write about Party comrades in a language that systematically spreads among the working masses hatred, aversion, contempt, etc., for those who hold other opinions. But *one may and must write* in that strain about an organisation that has seceded.

Why must one? Because when a split has taken place it is one's duty *to wrest* the masses from the leadership of the seceding section. I am told—you carried confusion into the ranks of the proletariat. My answer is—I purposely and deliberately carried confusion into the ranks of that section of the St. Petersburg proletariat which followed the Mensheviks who seceded on the eve of the elections, *and I shall always act in that way whenever a split occurs.*

Report to the Fifth Congress of the R.S.D I.P. on the St. Petersburg Split and the Institution of the Party Tribunal ensuing Therefrom, Vol. 12, pp. 425-26

Point Three of the preamble of our resolution²⁰⁰ speaks directly of the task of the proletariat as filling "the role of leader in the bourgeois-democratic revolution". The Mensheviks proposed an amendment—change the word "leader" for "vanguard", "advanced contingent" or the words "main motive force". All those amendments were rejected. Repeat as often as you will that the proletariat must retain its class independence—the Bolsheviks have nothing against that. But *to weaken* the words on the role of *leader* in the revolution would mean opening the doors to opportunism. The proletariat could be the "main motive force" in a curtailed, landlord-bourgeois revolution. It is possible to be the main motive force of the victory of another class without being able to defend the interests of your own class. Revolutionary Social-Democracy, if it is to remain true to itself, has no right to confine itself to that. It must help the proletariat to rise from the passive role of main motive force

to the active role of leader—to rise from the dependent position of a fighter for curtailed freedom to the most independent position of a fighter for complete freedom, a freedom that is to the advantage of the working class. The basic difference in the tactics of the opportunist and the revolutionary tactics of Social-Democracy in the bourgeois revolution is, one might say, that the former is reconciled to the role of the proletariat as the main motive force, while the latter is directed towards giving the proletariat the role of leader and by no means that of a mere “motive force”.

The expression “advanced contingent” would also weaken the recognition of the task of the proletariat as that of leading the other democratic classes, or could, at least, be interpreted in that way.

The Attitude Towards Bourgeois Parties,
Vol. 12, p. 501

A resolution must be written in unmistakable language. It must consider all existing political tendencies in actual politics, and not the good intentions of some section or another of Social-Democracy (always allowing that the intentions are of the best). In our resolution we have recognised, forthrightly and definitely, the “pseudo-socialism” of the Narodniks. We have called their “socialist” ideology simply “vague”, and have declared it absolutely imperative for Social-Democracy to fight against their concealment of the class antithesis between the proletariat and the petty proprietors. Everything has been said in these words, which condemn the really utopian element in Narodism, condemn petty-bourgeois “extra-class” revolutionism.

The Attitude Towards Bourgeois Parties,
Vol. 12, pp. 503-04

Compare the Menshevik Stockholm resolution with the Bolshevik London resolution on the State Duma. You will find that the former is pompous, wordy, full of high-flown phrases about the significance of the Duma and puffed up by a sense of the grandeur of work in the Duma. The latter is simple, concise, sober, and modest.

Against Boycott. Notes of a Social-Democratic Publicist, Vol. 13, p. 41

...I could not help recalling in this connection the story about a stranger who was present for the first time at a discussion between ancient philosophers but remained silent all the time. One of the philosophers said to the stranger: "If you are wise, you are behaving foolishly; if you are a fool, you are behaving wisely."

The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907, Vol. 13, pp. 310-11

When Plekhanov speaks he is brilliant and witty, he crackles, twirls, and sparkles like a Catherine-wheel. The trouble starts when the speech is taken down verbatim and later subjected to a logical examination.

The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907, Vol. 13, pp. 326-27

The second, very important, circumstance refers to the economic, and particularly the agrarian, programme of the Right. This is their defence of the private property in land of the *peasants*, a defence which is the keynote of all their speeches, including that of the arch-priest Mitrofanushka (Bishop Mitrofan), who spoke immediately after the reporter, evidently seeking to frighten the democratic but downtrodden village priests. Comically trying to overcome in himself the habit of playing the religious simpleton and of using the language of the seminary ("the village commune is a primordial phenomenon"), he mouthed such phrases as "Life develops in the direction of a greater and greater individuality of personality"; "We must recognise as useful the new pattern of life among our peasants on the model of the West-European farmers" (69).

The Agrarian Debates in the Third Duma, Vol. 15, p. 306

Boom, boom, boom.... While he absorbed and embodied in a consummate form the fundamental manner of declamation characteristic of liberal-bourgeois journalism, Mr. Nevedomsky proved to be also the purest and most consummate embodiment of the ideological principle of humanity in general—the principle of rant.

Heroes of "Reservation", Vol. 16, p. 371

...But one must know how to speak of a republic. One cannot speak about it in the same terms when addressing a meeting in a factory and one in a Cossack village, when speaking at a meeting of students or in a peasant cottage, when it is dealt with from the rostrum of the Third Duma or in the columns of a publication issued abroad. The art of any propagandist and agitator consists in his ability to find the best means of influencing any given audience, by presenting a definite truth in such a way as to make it most convincing, most easy to digest, most gigantic, and most strongly impressive.

The Slogans and Organisation of Social-Democratic Work Inside and Outside the Duma, Vol. 17, p. 341

There is nothing more repugnant to the spirit of Marxism than phrase-mongering. And the most unpleasant feature that strikes one in Nos. 6 and 7-8 of *Nasha Zarya*²⁰¹ is the incredible orgy of phrase-mongering that might truly be that of a Tartarin. The Tartarins of our liquidationist trend have converted an election campaign, something customary for Marxists in all lands, and which even in Russia has already been conducted *twice* on a large scale, into something wrapped up in so many pompous words, words and words, that it is simply unendurable.

Fundamental Problems of the Election Campaign, Vol. 17, p. 402

Having heard and discussed the report of the representative of the Central Organ,²⁰² the Conference approves of the Central Organ's line in principle and expresses the wish that more space be devoted to articles of a propagandist nature, and that the articles be written in a more popular style, so as to make them more intelligible to the workers.

The Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P., Vol. 17, p. 482

Secondly, Poincaré's career is worthy of note, being that of a typical bourgeois businessman who sells himself in turn to all parties in politics, and to all rich men "outside" politics. Poincaré has been a lawyer by profession since the age of twenty. At twenty-six he was a *chef de cabinet* and at thirty-three, a Minister. Rich men and the big-wigs of finance

in all countries, think highly of the political connections of such dexterous careerists. A "brilliant" lawyer-deputy and a political trickster are *synonyms* in the "civilised" countries.

The Significance of Poincaré's Election,
Vol. 18, p. 488

Mr. A. V. P. has contributed to *Russkoye Bogatstvo* No. 12 a "leading" article on a "current" subject, headed "Socialism—Popular or Proletarian?"

The article is quite shallow and pointless in itself. It is quite a long time since we encountered in the "leading" articles of a Narodnik publication that considers itself important, such a meaningless set of words, such a spate of evasive, bald phrases, or such a hotchpotch of (eclectic) views.

On Narodism, Vol. 18, p. 524

If the article "must be printed anyway" (as the secretary to the editorial board writes), then how am I to understand Vitimsky's²⁰¹ "the angry tone is harmful"? Since when has an *angry* tone against what is bad, harmful, untrue (and the editorial board is "in principle" in agreement!) harmed a daily newspaper?? On the contrary, colleagues, really and truly on the contrary. To write without "anger" of what is harmful means to write boringly. And you yourselves refer, and justly so, to monotony!

To the Editor of "Pravda", August 1,
1912, Vol. 35, p. 48

Dear Comrade,

I have received and read your article. I think the subject was well chosen and has been correctly elaborated, but the article will need some polishing up. There is far too much—how shall I put it?—"agitation", which is out of place in an article on a *theoretical* subject. Either you yourself, I think, ought to work it over, or we could do it.

To V. M. Kasparov, Vol. 36, p. 260

In this pamphlet the author gives a kind of summary of his four-volume work: "*Naturwissenschaften in ihrer Entwicklung und in ihrem Zusammenhange*".....
(((Much popularisation...)))

About 5,000 years of the development of civilisation from ancient Egypt to our time. According to Homer, the world was only the Mediterranean Sea and surrounding countries. (P. 8)*

In Egypt the clear nights facilitated the pursuit of astronomy. They observed the stars and their movement, the moon, etc.

At first the month was reckoned as 30 days, and the year as 360 (p. 31). The ancient Egyptians already had 365 days. (P. 32) Eratosthenes (276 B.C.) determined the circumference of the earth as 250,000 "stadia"=45,000 km. (instead of 40,000).

Aristarchus guessed that the earth revolved round the sun, p. 37 (1,800 years Before Copernicus, 1473-1543). (Third century B.C.) he considered the moon to be 30 (instead of 48) times smaller than the earth, and the sun to be 300 (instead of 1,300,000) times larger than the earth....

The author carelessly, pompously, vulgarly, in feuilleton style outlines philosophical questions, banal.

The booklet is neither here nor there: for a philosophical work it is careless, sententious, petty, banal;— for a popular work it is pretentious.

Philosophical Notebooks, Fl. Dannemann, *How Did Our Picture of the World Arise?*, (Kosmos), Stuttgart, 1912, Vol. 38, pp. 331-32

The people should be spoken to without Latin words, in clear and simple terms.

Report at a Meeting of Bolshevik Delegates to the All-Russia Conference of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, April 4(17), 1917, Vol. 36, p. 438

* Dannemann, Fr., *Wie unser Weltbild entstand?* Stuttgart, 1912.—Ed.

I shall conclude by referring to a speech which impressed me most. I heard a coal miner deliver a remarkable speech. Without using a single bookish word, he told us how they had made the revolution.

Report on the Current Situation, April 24 (May 7), The Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), Vol. 24, p. 242

To a Marxist these truths—that wars are waged by the capitalists and are bound up with the capitalists' class interests—are absolute truths. A Marxist need not dwell on that. But as far as the masses are concerned, skilful agitators and propagandists should be able to explain this truth simply, without using foreign words, for with us discussions usually degenerate into empty and futile squabbling.

Speech in Favour of the Resolution on the War, April 27 (May 10), The Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), Vol. 24, p. 265

So, in the declaration of the Soviet majority made by Comrade Martov at the Democratic Conference,²⁰⁴ we read:

"The Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, set up in the first days of the revolution by a mighty burst of creative enthusiasm that stems from the people themselves, constitute the new fabric of the revolutionary state that has replaced the outworn state fabric of the old regime. ..."

This is a little too flowery; that is to say, rhetoric here covers up lack of clear political thinking. The Soviets have *not yet* replaced the old "fabric", and this old "fabric" is *not* the state fabric of the old regime, but the state fabric of *both* tsarism *and* of the bourgeois republic.

Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?, Vol. 26, p. 103

More economics. But not in the sense of "general" discussions, learned reviews, intellectual plans and similar piffle, for, I regret to say, they are all too often just piffle and nothing more. By economics we mean the gathering, *careful checking* and study of the facts of the actual organisation of the new life. Have *real* successes been achieved by big factories, agricultural communes, the Poor Peasants' Committees, and local Economic Councils in

building up the new economy? What, precisely, are these successes? Have they been verified? Are they not fables, boasting, intellectual promises ("things are moving", "the plan has been drawn up", "we are getting underway", "we now vouch for", "there is undoubted improvement", and other charlatan phrases of which "we" are such masters)? How have the successes been achieved? What must be done to extend them?

The Character of Our Newspapers,
Vol. 28, p. 96

*There is no choice for those who are leaving for the front as representatives of the workers and peasants. Their slogan must be victory or death. Each of you must be able to approach the most backward, the least developed Red Army men in order to explain the situation to them in the most comprehensible language, from the standpoint of a man of labour, help them in a moment of difficulty, eliminate all wavering, teach them to fight against numerous manifestations of inertia, sabotage, deception or treachery.

Speech to Students of the Sverdlov University Leaving for the Front, October 24, 1919, Vol. 30, p. 83

...Thanks to Comrade Kalinin our work in the countryside has gained considerable momentum. The peasant is now undoubtedly in a position to keep in closer contact with the Soviet government through Comrade Kalinin, who represents the supreme authority of the Soviet Republic. In this way we said in effect to the middle peasant: "There can be no question of forcibly imposing socialism on anyone." But we must make him understand this, we must know how to tell him this in a language the peasant understands best of all....

Speech Delivered at the First All-Russia Conference on Party Work in the Countryside, November 18, 1919, Vol. 30, p. 146

...You will have to base yourselves on the bourgeois nationalism which is awakening, and must awaken, among those peoples, and which has its historical justification. At the same time, you must find your way to the working and

exploited masses of every country and tell them in a language they understand that their only hope of emancipation lies in the victory of the international revolution, and that the international proletariat is the only ally of all the hundreds of millions of the working and exploited peoples of the East.

Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East, November 22, 1919, Vol. 30, p. 162

On the other hand, one can see simply a thoughtless and incoherent use of the now "fashionable" terms: "masses" and "leaders". These people have heard and memorised a great many attacks on "leaders", in which the latter have been contrasted with the "masses"; however, they have proved unable to think matters out and gain a clear understanding of what it was all about.

"Left-Wing" Communism—an Infantile Disorder, Vol. 31, p. 42

Take this famous "industrial democracy", which Comrade Bukharin hastened to insert in the Central Committee's resolution of December 7. It would, of course, be ridiculous to quibble about this ill-conceived brainchild ("tricky flourishes"), if it merely occurred in an article or speech. But, after all, it was Trotsky and Bukharin who put themselves into the ridiculous position by *insisting in their theses* on this very term, which is the one feature that distinguishes their "platforms" from Rudzutak's theses adopted by the trade unions.

Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin, Vol. 32, p. 81

7. This newspaper, devoted to matters of production, should be a popular one, in the sense of being understood by millions of readers, without falling into vulgarisation. The paper should not descend to the level of the uncultivated reader, but should work steadily—and by very gradual degrees—to promote his development.

Theses on Production Propaganda, Vol. 31, p. 405

Under capitalism, a newspaper is a capitalist enterprise, a means of enrichment, a medium of information and entertainment for the rich, and an instrument for duping and cheating the mass of working people. We have smashed this instrument of profit-making and deceit. We *have begun* to convert the newspapers into an instrument for educating the masses and for teaching them to live and run their economy *without* the landowners and capitalists. But we are only at the start of the road. Not much has been done during the last three years or so. A great deal remains to be done: the road ahead is very long indeed. Let us have less political fireworks, fewer general arguments and abstract slogans from inexperienced Communists who fail to understand their tasks; let us have more production propaganda and, above all, more efficient and capable application of practical experience to fit the development of the masses.

*The Work of the People's Commissariat
for Education, Vol. 32, p. 130*

...The fact is that Bukharin opens his appeal to the masses with such an outlandish term that he must *give a gloss on* it. This, I think, is *undemocratic* from the democratic standpoint. You must write for the masses without using terms that require a glossary...

*Once Again on the Trade Unions, the
Current Situation and the Mistakes of
Trotsky and Bukharin, Vol. 32, p. 81*

Citizen Yermansky's²⁰⁵ book has one serious flaw which may make it unacceptable as a textbook. It is the author's verbosity. He repeats the same thing again and again without any conceivable need.

A Fly in the Ointment, Vol. 33, p. 368

VII. ON TRANSLATION

...In the translation of this passage Mr. N.—on is guilty of two mistranslations and of one omission. Instead of “petty-bourgeois” and “petty-peasant” he translates “narrow-burgher” and “narrow-peasant.” Instead of “cudgels for the workers” he translates “cudgels for the people,” although in the original we have the word *Arbeiter*. ...He omitted the words: “were bound to be exploded” (*gesprengt werden mussten*).

A Characterisation of Economic Romanticism (Sismondi and Our Native Sismondists), Vol. 2, p. 248, footnote

As far as concerns *verbalisme* and *phraséologie* it seems to me that they should be translated as verbalism (with an explanation) and phraseology.... That, of course, is not really translation but simply transcription, but what else can you do? “Dilettantism” is quite wrong for verbalism—almost the opposite, in fact. Verbalism is probably closer to scholasticism, i.e., to superfluous (pseudo) learnedness, than to dilettantism. But I don’t remember exactly how Labriola uses these words.

To His Mother, February 7, 1898.
Vol. 37, pp. 151-52

...The Russian translator,²⁰⁶ on p. 182, rendered the word “*potenziert*”^{*} as “potential”. These Russian translations are an awful nuisance! On page 270, the same translator translates the sentence, “*Wer isst zuletzt das Schwein?*”^{**} as “Who, in the end, is the pig?”...

The Agrarian Question and the “Critics of Marx”, Vol. 5, p. 153

^{*} Raised to a higher power, abundant.—*Ed.*

^{**} Who, in the end, eats the pig?—*Ed.*

That, incidentally, is my answer to those Socialist-Revolutionaries who have simply interpreted the term "adventurer" as "swindler" (Mr. Rafailov in Geneva) or "rogue" (Mr. Zhitlovsky in Berne). Gentlemen, I told them, you should not necessarily interpret everything in terms of the criminal code! The adventurism of a revolutionary trend, an internally contradictory, unprincipled, unstable trend which conceals emptiness behind high-sounding promises and is therefore inevitably doomed to bankruptcy, should not be confused with the adventurism of rogues who know very well that they are committing punishable offences and that they are in danger of being exposed for swindling.

Basic Theses Against Socialist-Revolutionaries, Vol. 6, p. 273

In translating Engels²⁰⁷ I made a mistake in the first edition by taking the word *Buttermilch* to be not a proper noun but a common noun. This mistake naturally afforded great delight to the Mensheviks. Koltsov wrote that I had "rendered Engels more profound" (reprinted in *Two Years*, a collection of articles) and Plekhanov even now recalls this mistake in *Tovarishch*—in short, it afforded an excellent pretext to slur over the question of the two tendencies in the working-class movement of 1848 in Germany, the Born tendency (akin to our Economists) and the Marxist tendency. To take advantage of the mistake of an opponent, even if it concerns Born's name, is more than natural. But to use a correction to a translation to slur over the substance of the question of the two tactics is to dodge the real issue.

Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, V I. 9, p. 139, footnote

...At the moment when the firing in Moscow was subsiding,²⁰⁸ and when the military and police dictatorship was indulging in its savage orgies, when repressions and mass torture were raging all over Russia, *Polyarnaya Zvezda*²⁰⁹ protested against the use of force by the Lefts, and against the strike committees organised by the revolutionary parties. The Cadet professors who are trading in their science for the benefit of the Dubasovs went to the length (like Mr. Kiesewetter, member of the Central Committee of the

Cadet Party and candidate for the Duma) of translating the word "dictatorship" by the words "reinforced security"! These "men of science" even distorted their high-school Latin in order to discredit the revolutionary struggle....

*The Victory of the Cadets and the Tasks
of the Workers' Party*, Vol. 10, p. 216

I have before me the newspapers published by both trends of British socialism containing comments on the meeting of the International Bureau.²¹⁰ The organ of the Independent (ahem! ahem!) Labour Party, the *Labour Leader*, rejoices, and *openly declares* to tens of thousands of British workers that the International Socialist Bureau not only recognised the Labour Party (that is true, and it had to be done) but also "*vindicated the policy of the I.L.P.*"²¹¹ (*Labour Leader*, October 16, 1908, p. 665). This is not true. The Bureau did *not* vindicate it. This is an illegitimate, opportunist interpretation of a slight awkwardness in Kautsky's resolution. This slight awkwardness is beginning to bear rather abundant fruit; on top of this comes a poor translation: no wonder the Italians say that translators are traducers (*traduttori—tradittori*). The official translations of the Bureau resolutions into the three official languages have not been published yet, and it is not known when they will appear. Kautsky's resolution states that the Labour Party «adopts the standpoint of the class struggle" (end of the resolution; in the original: *sich ... auf seinen, d.h. des Klassenkampfes, Boden stellt*), which, in the translation of the British *Social-Democrats* reads: "places itself in consequence on the ground of international socialism." In the translation of the British *opportunists* (I.L.P.) it reads: "*adopts the position of international socialism*". (Ibid.)

*Meeting of the International Socialist
Bureau*, Vol. 15, p. 238

...Mr. V. Chernov translates the word *Spiegelbild* literally (a mirror reflection), accusing Plekhanov of presenting the theory of Engels "*in a very weakened form*" by speaking in Russian simply of a "reflection" instead of a "mirror reflection".²¹² This is mere cavilling. *Spiegelbild* in German is also used simply in the sense of *Abbild*.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, p. 100, footnote

Instead of "prove the this-sidedness of thinking" (a literal translation), Plekhanov has: prove that thinking "does not stop at this side of phenomena". And Mr. V. Chernov cries: "The contradiction between Marx and Engels has been eliminated very simply.... It appears as though Marx, like Engels, asserted the knowability of things-in-themselves and the 'other-sidedness' of thinking" (loc. cit., p. 34, note)....

...It is sheer illiteracy, Mr. Victor Chernov, to assert that from Plekhanov's paraphrase (Plekhanov gave a paraphrase and not a translation) "it appears as though" Marx defended the *other-sidedness* of thought. Because only the Humeans and the Kantians confine thought to "this side of phenomena". But for all materialists, including those of the seventeenth century whom Bishop Berkeley demolished (see Introduction), "phenomena" are "things-for-us" or *copies* of the "objects in themselves". Of course, Plekhanov's free paraphrase is not obligatory for those who desire to know Marx himself, but it is obligatory to try to understand what Marx meant and not to prance about like a Voroshilov.

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, pp. 104-05

"...Inside the limits within which we have to do with objects in practice, *perceptions of the object and of its properties coincide with the reality existing outside us.* 'To coincide' is somewhat different from being a 'hieroglyphic'. 'They coincide' means that, within the given limits, the sense-perception is [Bazarov's italics] the reality existing outside us...."

The end crowns the work. Engels has been treated à la Mach, fried and served with a Machist sauce. But take care you do not choke, worthy cooks!...

To say that "sense-perception is the reality existing outside us" is to return to *Humism*, or even *Berkeleyanism*, concealing itself in the fog of "co-ordination". This is either an idealist lie or the subterfuge of the agnostic, Comrade Bazarov, for sense-perception is *not* the reality existing outside us, it is only the *image* of that reality. Are you trying to make capital of the ambiguous Russian word *sovpadat*?* Are you trying to lead the unsophisticated reader to believe that "to coincide"

* *Sovpadat*—to coincide.—Ed.

here means "to be identical", and not "to correspond"? That means basing one's falsification of Engels à la Mach on a perversion of the meaning of a quotation, and nothing more.

Take the German original and you will find there the words *stimmen mit*, which means to correspond with, "to voice with"—the latter translation is literal, for *Stimme* means voice. The words "*stimmen mit*" cannot mean "to coincide" in the sense of "*to be identical*". And even for the reader who does not know German but who reads Engels with the least bit of attention, it is perfectly clear, it cannot be otherwise than clear, that Engels throughout his whole argument treats the expression "sense-perception" as the *image* (*Abbild*) of the reality existing outside us, and that therefore the word "coincide" can be used in Russian exclusively in the sense of "correspondence", "concurrence", etc. To attribute to Engels the thought that "sense-perception is the reality existing outside us" is such a gem of Machist distortion, such a flagrant attempt to palm off agnosticism and idealism as materialism, that one must admit that Bazarov has broken all records!

Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,
Vol. 14, p. 113-15

This song has been translated into all European and other languages. In whatever country a class-conscious worker finds himself, wherever fate may cast him, however much he may feel himself a stranger, without language, without friends, far' more from his native country—he can find himself comrades and friends by the familiar refrain of the *Internationale*.

Eugene Pottier. The 25th Anniversary
of His Death, Vol. 36, p. 223

It should be observed that the international discussion of this question was conducted mainly, if not exclusively, in the German language. The Germans, however, use two words, the difference between which is not easily rendered in Russian. One, strictly speaking, means "disarmament",* and is used by Kautsky and the Kautskyites, for instance, in the sense of reduction of armaments. The other, strictly speaking, means "disarming",** and is used mainly by the Lefts in

* Abrüstung.—Ed.

** Entwaffnung.—Ed.

the sense of abolishing militarism, abolishing all militarist systems. In this article we speak of the *latter* demand, which is current among certain *revolutionary* Social-Democrats.

The "Disarmament" Slogan, Vol. 23, p. 95

Let us begin with the most popular of Engels's works, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, the sixth edition of which was published in Stuttgart as far back as 1894. We shall have to translate the quotations from the German originals, as the Russian translations, while very numerous, are for the most part either incomplete or very unsatisfactory.

The State and Revolution. The Marxist Theory of the State and the Tasks of the Proletariat in the Revolution, Vol. 25, p. 391

Engels wrote to Bebel criticising that same draft of the Gotha Programme²¹³ which Marx criticised in his famous letter to Bracke. Referring specially to the question of the state, Engels said:

"The free people's state has been transformed into the free state. Taken in its grammatical sense, a free state is one where the state is free in relation to its citizens, hence a state with a despotic government. The whole talk about the state should be dropped, especially since the Commune, which was no longer a state in the proper sense of the word. The 'people's state' has been thrown in our faces by the anarchists to the point of disgust, although already Marx's book against Proudhon²¹⁴ and later the *Communist Manifesto* say plainly that with the introduction of the socialist order of society the state dissolves of itself [sich auflöst] and disappears. As the state is only a transitional institution which is used in the struggle, in the revolution, to hold down one's adversaries by force, it is sheer nonsense to talk of a 'free people's state'; so long as the proletariat still *needs* the state, it does not need it in the interests of freedom but in order to hold down its adversaries, and soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom the state as such ceases to exist. We would therefore

propose replacing *state* everywhere by *Gemeinwesen*, a good old German word which can very well take the place of the French word *commune*." (Pp. 321-22 of the German original.)

It should be borne in mind that this letter refers to the party programme which Marx criticised in a letter dated only a few weeks later than the above (Marx's letter is dated May 5, 1875), and that at the time Engels was living with Marx in London. Consequently, when he says "we" in the last sentence, Engels undoubtedly, in his own as well as in Marx's name, suggests to the leader of the German workers' party that the word "state" *be struck out of the programme* and replaced by the word "*community*".

What a howl about "anarchism" would be raised by the leading lights of present-day "Marxism", which has been falsified for the convenience of the opportunists, if such an amendment of the programme were suggested to them!

Let them howl. This will earn them the praises of the bourgeoisie.

And we shall go on with our work. In revising the programme of our Party, we must by all means take the advice of Engels and Marx into consideration in order to come nearer the truth, to restore Marxism by ridding it of distortions, to guide the struggle of the working class for its emancipation more correctly. Certainly no one opposed to the advice of Engels and Marx will be found among the Bolsheviks. The only difficulty that may perhaps arise will be in regard to the term. In German there are two words meaning "community", of which Engels used the one which does *not* denote a single community, but their totality, a system of communities. In Russian there is no such word, and we may have to choose the French word "commune", although this also has its drawbacks.

"The Commune was no longer a state in the proper sense of the word"—this is the most theoretically important statement Engels makes. After what has been said above, this statement is perfectly clear. The Commune²¹⁵ *was ceasing to be a state* since it had to suppress, not the majority of the population, but a minority (the exploiters). It had smashed the bourgeois state machine. In place of a *special* coercive force the population itself came on the scene. All this was a

departure from the state in the proper sense of the word. And had the Commune become firmly established, all traces of the state in it would have "withered away" of themselves: it would not have had to "abolish" the institutions of the state—they would have ceased to function as they ceased to have anything to do.

The State and Revolution, Vol. 25,
pp. 444-46

Undoubtedly, an immeasurably larger number of Kautsky's works have been translated into Russian than into any other language. It is not without reason that some German Social-Democrats say in jest that Kautsky is read more in Russia than in Germany (let us say, in parenthesis, that this jest has a far deeper historical meaning than those who first made it suspect. The Russian workers, by making in 1905 an unusually great and unprecedented demand for the best works of the best Social-Democratic literature in the world, and by receiving translations and editions of these works in quantities unheard of in other countries, rapidly transplanted, so to speak, the enormous experience of a neighbouring, more advanced country to the young soil of our proletarian movement).

The State and Revolution, Vol 25,
pp. 481-82

...(versagen; this German expression is somewhat stronger than "inadequate" and somewhat weaker than "impotent")....

*The Proletarian Revolution and the
Renegade Kautsky*, Vol. 28, p. 258

VIII. ON SPEECH CULTURE

The basic thesis I am advancing against the Socialist-Revolutionaries, and for an appraisal of *all* aspects of the activities (and of the whole essence) of this trend is as follows: *the entire trend of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, and their party as a whole, is nothing but an attempt by the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia at escamotage of our working-class movement, and, consequently, the whole of the socialist and the whole of the revolutionary movement in Russia.*

Let me explain at once why, in this thesis which is so important to me, I could not avoid employing a rare foreign word no doubt incomprehensible to most readers. Escamotage means deception, fraudulent appropriation of the results of the labour of others and thus rendering this labour useless, trickery, swindling, etc. It is not difficult to see why I had to reject these Russian words and choose a foreign word instead. The words "to trick, fool, deceive" are invariably associated in our minds with the idea of a deliberate, conscious lie,—that in the first place, and in the second, with the idea of self-seeking, dishonest motives on the part of those who resort to this lie. Yet I am far from the idea of accusing the Socialist-Revolutionaries of anything resembling a conscious lie or dishonest motives. Nothing of the kind. I have no doubt that as a trend, as a "party", the Socialist-Revolutionaries could have originated (or could have survived since the days of the Narodnaya Volya), that they could have grown and gained some strength of late, thanks *entirely* to the fact that they attracted people doubtlessly revolutionary-minded and even quite prepared for heroic self-sacrifice, people in all sincerity willing to lay down their lives in the interests of freedom and the interests of the people... Would not the results of the best-intended activity based on this stand prove to be (even though unconsciously and against the will of those who conduct it) "escamotage" of the

working-class movement, diverting it from the correct course, decoying it into an impasse, etc.?

Basic Thesis Against Socialist-Revolutionaries, Vol. 6, p. 271-72

The formulation of the *conditions* of proletarian support for the *Osvobozhdeniye* League²¹⁶ is the gem of gems in Parvus's²¹⁷ remarkable article. "It is necessary," writes Parvus, "to impose definite political demands on the opposition candidates who wish to avail themselves of our support." (A poor Russian translation from the German, but the meaning is clear.)

Playing at Parliamentarianism, Vol. 9, p. 278

Is a sense of national pride alien to us, Great-Russian class-conscious proletarians? Certainly not! We love our language and our country, and we are doing our very utmost to raise *her* toiling masses (i.e., nine-tenths of *her* population) to the level of a democratic and socialist consciousness. To us it is most painful to see and feel the outrages, the oppression and the humiliation our fair country suffers at the hands of the tsar's butchers, the nobles and the capitalists. We take pride in the resistance to these outrages put up from our midst, from the Great Russians; in *that* midst having produced Radishchev, the Decembrists and the revolutionary commoners of the seventies; in the Great-Russian working class having created, in 1905, a mighty revolutionary party of the masses; and in the Great-Russian peasantry having begun to turn towards democracy and set about overthrowing the clergy and the landed proprietors.

On the National Pride of the Great Russians, Vol. 21, p. 103

...It should have attacked the Russian bourgeoisie for denying the oppressed nations the right to secede, a denial which is *tantamount to annexation*. Instead, the Organising Committee²¹⁸ attacks the Finns and warns them that "separate" (they should have said separatist) tendencies would strengthen centralist inclinations!

Finland and Russia, Vol. 24, p. 337

...It would be on a par with inserting the demand for a world Economic Council. We ourselves have not yet grown accustomed to this ugly word *Sovnarkhoz*—Economic Council; as for foreigners, it is said that some of them searched the railway directory, thinking that there was a station of that name. (*Laughter.*) We cannot dictate such words to the whole world by means of decrees.

Speech Closing the Debate on the Party Programme, March 19, Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), Vol. 29, pp. 188-89

We are spoiling the Russian language. We are using foreign words unnecessarily. And we use them incorrectly. Why use the foreign word *defekty* when we have three Russian synonyms—*nedochoty*, *nedostatki*, *probely*.

A man who has recently learned to read in general, and to read newspapers in particular, will, of course, if he reads them diligently, willy-nilly absorb journalistic turns of speech. However, it is the language of the newspapers that is beginning to suffer. If a man who has recently learned to read uses foreign words as a novelty, he is to be excused, but there is no excuse for a writer. Is it not time for us to declare war on the unnecessary use of foreign words?

I must admit that the unnecessary use of foreign words annoys me (because it makes it more difficult for us to exercise our influence over the masses) but some of the mistakes made by those who write in the newspapers make me really angry. For instance—the word *budirovat* is used in the meaning of arouse, awaken, stir up. It comes from the French word *bouder* which means to sulk, to pout, which is what *budirovat* should really mean. This adoption of Nizhni-Novgorod French is the adoption of the worst from the worst representatives of the Russian landowning class, who learned some French but who, first, did not master the language, and who, secondly, distorted the Russian language.

Is it not time to declare war on the spoiling of Russian?

Stop Spoiling the Russian Language
Some Thoughts at Leisure; i.e., While
Listening to Speeches at Meetings,
Vol. 30, p. 298

I shall permit myself only to say, for my part, that at first I was highly averse to any change in the name of your

institution. In my opinion, the function of the People's Commissariat of Education is to help people learn and teach others. My Soviet experience has taught me to regard titles as childish jokes; after all, any title is a joke in its way. Another name has now been endorsed: [Glavpolitprosvet] the Chief Committee for Political Education.²¹⁹

As this matter has already been decided, you must take this as nothing more than a personal remark. If the matter is not limited merely to a change of label, it is only to be welcomed.

If we succeed in drawing new people into cultural and educational work, it will not be just a change of title... If we succeed, we shall have achieved something more than ever before.

Speech Delivered at an All-Russia Conference of Political Education Workers of Gubernia and Uyezd Education Departments, November 3, 1920, Vol. 31, p. 363

...I would like very much to quote the example of several Gos-trests (if I may express myself in the beautiful Russian language that Turgenev praised so highly)* to show how we run the economy.

Political Report of the Central Committee of the R.C.P.(B.), March 27, Eleventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), Vol. 33, p. 273

The writer of a speech should not leave nonsense and make omissions that are obviously absurd. The writer of a speech should be able to *supplement* them with 2-3 words so that there is always a *connection*. Not be afraid of sometimes changing from the first person to the third ((“having touched upon this or reiterated that, the speaker went on to say” (then the first person again))). Experienced and skilled writers of speeches always make use of shorthand notes as material, in order to quote *freely* one thing in the first person and another in the third, without striving for a

* An ironical reference to the habit, then prevailing, of abbreviating the names of various institutions. Here the abbreviation stands for *state trusts*.—*Ed.*

ridiculous pretension (always in the first person, everything in full), which is both ridiculous and harmful.

7/III Lenin

To M. I. Glyasser, March 7, 1922.
V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Fifth
Russian Edition, Vol. 54, pp. 201-02

APPENDIX

A) GENERAL CULTURAL QUESTIONS

...Capitalism is progressive in its significance precisely because it has destroyed the old cramped conditions of human life that created mental stultification and prevented the producers from taking their destinies into their own hands. The tremendous development of trade relations and world exchange and the constant migrations of vast masses of the population have shattered the age-old fetters of the tribe, family and territorial community, and created that variety of development, that "variety of talents and wealth of social relationships,"* which plays so great a part in the modern history of the West. In Russia this process has been fully manifested in the post-Reform era, when the ancient forms of labour very rapidly collapsed and prime place was assumed by the purchase and sale of labour-power, which tore the peasant from the patriarchal, semi-feudal family, from the stupefying conditions of village life and replaced the semi-feudal forms of appropriation of surplus-value by purely capitalist forms. This economic process has been reflected in the social sphere by a "general heightening of the sense of individuality," by the middle-class intellectuals squeezing the landlord class out of "society," by a heated literary war against senseless medieval restrictions on the individual, and so on.

*The Economic Content of Narodism and
the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book,
Vol. 1, p. 414*

Marx and Engels, who both knew Russian and read Russian books, took a lively interest in the country, followed the Russian revolutionary movement with sympathy and maintained contact with Russian revolutionaries. They both

* K. Marx, *Der achtzehnte Brumaire*, S. 98, u.s.w.

became socialists after being *democrats*, and the democratic feeling of *hatred* for political despotism was exceedingly strong in them... That is why the heroic struggle of the handful of Russian revolutionaries against the mighty tsarist government evoked a most sympathetic echo in the hearts of these tried revolutionaries.

Frederick Engels, Vol. 2, pp. 26-27

...At this point, we wish to state only that the *role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory*. To have a concrete understanding of what this means, let the reader recall such predecessors of Russian Social-Democracy as Herzen, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, and the brilliant galaxy of revolutionaries of the seventies; let him ponder over the world significance which Russian literature is now acquiring; let him ... but be that enough!

What Is to Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement, Vol. 5, p. 370

Marx's health was undermined by his strenuous work in the International and his still more strenuous theoretical occupations. He continued work on the refashioning of political economy and on the completion of *Capital*, for which he collected a mass of new material and studied a number of languages (Russian, for instance). However, ill-health prevented him from completing *Capital*.

Karl Marx. A Brief Biographical Sketch With an Exposition of Marxism, Vol. 21, p. 49

It is self-evident that final victory can be won only by the proletariat of all the advanced countries of the world, and we, the Russians, are beginning the work which the British, French or German proletariat will consolidate. But we see that they will not be victorious without the aid of the working people of all the oppressed colonial nations, first and foremost, of Eastern nations. We must realise that the transition to communism cannot be accomplished by the *vanguard* alone. The task is to arouse the working masses to revolutionary activity, to independent action and to organisation, regardless of the level they have reached; to translate the true communist doctrine, which was intended for the

Communists of the more advanced countries, into the language of every people; to carry out those practical tasks which must be carried out immediately, and to join the proletarians of other countries in a common struggle.

Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East, November 22, 1919, Vol. 30, pp. 161-62

...The whole point here is that, with the transformation of the old, capitalist society, the upbringing, training and education of the new generations that will create the communist society cannot be conducted on the old lines. The teaching, training and education of the youth must proceed from the material that has been left to us by the old society. We can build communism only on the basis of the totality of knowledge, organisations and institutions, only by using the stock of human forces and means that have been left to us by the old society.

The Tasks of the Youth Leagues, Speech Delivered at the Third All-Russia Congress of the Russian Young Communist League, October 2, 1920, Vol. 31, p. 284

...We shall be unable to solve this problem unless we clearly realise that only a precise knowledge and transformation of the culture created by the entire development of mankind will enable us to create a proletarian culture. The latter is not clutched out of thin air; it is not an invention of those who call themselves experts in proletarian culture. That is all nonsense. Proletarian culture must be the logical development of the store of knowledge mankind has accumulated under the yoke of capitalist, landowner and bureaucratic society. All these roads have been leading, and will continue to lead up to proletarian culture, in the same way as political economy, as reshaped by Marx, has shown us what human society must arrive at, shown us the passage to the class struggle, to the beginning of the proletarian revolution.

The Tasks of the Youth Leagues, Speech Delivered at the Third All-Russia Congress of the Russian Young Communist League, October 2, 1920, Vol. 31, p. 287

4) Marxism has won its historic significance as the ideology of the revolutionary proletariat because, far from rejecting the most valuable achievements of the bourgeois epoch, it has, on the contrary, assimilated and refashioned everything of value in the more than two thousand years of the development of human thought and culture. Only further work on this basis and in this direction, inspired by the practical experience of the proletarian dictatorship as the final stage in the struggle against every form of exploitation, can be recognised as the development of a genuine proletarian culture.

On Proletarian Culture, Vol. 31, p. 317

2. Not the *invention* of a new proletarian culture, but the *development* of the best models, traditions and results of the *existing* culture, *from the point of view* of the Marxist world outlook and the conditions of life and struggle of the proletariat in the period of its dictatorship.

Rough Draft of a Resolution on Proletarian Culture, Vol. 42, p. 217

Our opponents told us repeatedly that we were rash in undertaking to implant socialism in an insufficiently cultured country. But they were misled by our having started from the opposite end to that prescribed by theory (the theory of pedants of all kinds), because in our country the political and social revolution preceded the cultural revolution, that very cultural revolution which nevertheless now confronts us.

On Co-Operation, Vol. 33, pp. 471-75

B) DICTIONARIES AND LIBRARIES

Comrade Lunacharsky,

Recently I had occasion—to my regret and shame, for the first time—to look through the famous Dahl dictionary.

It's a magnificent thing, but then it's a dictionary of *regional* terms, and out of date. Is it not time to produce a dictionary of the *real* Russian language, a dictionary, say, of

words used *nowadays* and by the *classics*, from Pushkin to Gorky?

What if 30 scholars were set to work at this, and provided with Red Army rations?

What would be your attitude to this idea?

A dictionary of the classical Russian language?

Without making a noise about it, have a talk with people who know the subject, if it's not too much trouble, and let me know your opinion.

To A. V. Lunacharsky. January 18,
1920. Vol. 35, p. 434

Comrade Pokrovsky,

Some time ago it happened that I talked with Comrade Lunacharsky about the necessity of publishing a good dictionary of the Russian language. Not like Dahl, but a dictionary for use (and study) by all, a dictionary, so to speak, of the classical, contemporary Russian language (for example, from Pushkin to Gorky, perhaps). Provide about 30 scholars, or as many as are needed, with rations, taking, of course, those who are not suitable for any other work—and let them do the job.

Lunacharsky said that he had been thinking about this already, and that it was either being done or would be done.

Be so kind as to find out whether it is being done, and drop me a line.

Yours,

Lenin

To M. N. Pokrovsky. May 5, 1920,
Vol. 35, p. 447

Comrade Litkens,

I forgot when we met to ask you to check how matters stand with the committee of scholars who are drawing up a dictionary (brief) of the *contemporary* (from Pushkin to Gorky) Russian language.

I long ago, and many times, made arrangements for this with Pokrovsky and Lunacharsky.

Is it being done? What precisely? Find out and send me exact details.

With communist greetings,

Lenin

To Y. A. Litkens. May 6, 1921,
Vol. 35, p. 489

Comrade Litkens,

Your letter (about the dictionary) is wrong.

You are wishing the administering on M. N. Pokrovsky, instead of *relieving* him of it.

The job of the *administrator* is to give orders 1) for *papers* to be found (was there a resolution? by whom? when? who is responsible?).

2) If "the matter has *not* been expedited", to find out *why* (if because of rations—how much?—perhaps we'll postpone until autumn?)

With a com. greeting *Lenin*

P. S. I remember Pokrovsky *telling* me many times that he was not *administering*.

That is the crux of the matter! Perhaps you would wait until Pokrovsky goes away on leave and *then* look for paper?

To Y. A. Litkens, May 9, 1921.
V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Fifth
Russian Edition, Vol. 52, pp. 182-83

Take advantage of Pokrovsky's holiday to begin work on the compiling of a dictionary of the Russian language without burdening him with administrative functions.

(1) Appoint a committee of 3-5 of the best philologists. They should within two weeks draw up a plan and the composition of the final committee (to [define] the work, its nature, time limits, etc.).

(2) The task is a brief dictionary of the Russian language, from Pushkin to Gorky (the *small* "Larousse" as a model). Model, and contemporary. With the new orthography.

(3) On the basis of their report (of the 3-5), some *scientific academic* centre must *endorse* the plan. Then we shall begin by the autumn.

To Y. A. Litkens, May 19, 1921,
Vol. 35, p. 494

Comrade Litkens,

So let us agree on the question of the dictionary as follows:

(1) Approximately within a month (in the absence of Pokrovsky) adopt a *formal* decision and appoint a *responsible person* or *persons*.

(2) On the basis of this decision draw up a *plan* of work, indicating not only the persons responsible but also the expenditure and rations required.

The plan should provide for the work to begin in August or September.

Lenin

To Y. A. Litkens, late in May, 1921,
Vol. 35, p. 503

Ask Litkens whether the matter is at a "standstill" (or *has been expedited*)?

Send me Litkens' reply.

Lenin

To a Secretary, August 5, 1921, Fifth
Russian Edition, Vol. 53, p. 95

* ...Instead of *regulations*, discussed and elaborated by a dozen committees of civil servants inventing hundreds of formalities and obstacles to the use of books, they see to it that even *children* can make use of the rich collections; that readers can read publicly-owned books at home; they regard as the pride and glory of a public library, not the number of rarities it contains, the number of sixteenth-century editions or tenth-century manuscripts, but *the extent* to which books are distributed *among the people*, the number of new readers enrolled, the speed with which the demand for any book is met, the number of books issued to be read at home, the number of children attracted to reading and to the use of the library....

What Can Be Done for Public Education,
Vol. 19, p. 277

4.1.1920

Dear V. D.,

I am paying *personally* for my library.

When you are well again, please pay everything

3,200

+ 500 (Dahl)

3,700, etc.

and keep the receipts.

Yours,

Lenin

I enclose 4,000 rubles.

The library of the C.P.C.'s *Managing Department* is another matter.

To V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich, January 4,
1920, Vol. 44, p. 327

If, according to the rules, reference publications are not issued for home use, could not one get them for an evening, for the night, when the Library is closed. *I will return them by the morning.*

For reference for *one* day:

I. The two *best*, fullest, dictionaries of the *Greek* language, Greek-German, -French, -Russian or -English.

II. The best *philosophical* dictionaries, dictionaries of philosophical terms: the German, I think, is Eisler; the English, I think, is Baldwin; the French, I think, is Frank (if there is nothing newer); the Russian, the latest you have.

III. A history of Greek philosophy

1) Zeller, the complete and latest edition.

2) Gomperz (the Vienna philosopher): *Griechische Denker*.*

*To the Library of the Rumyantsev
Museum, September 1, 1920, Vol. 35,
p. 454*

The first fault is perhaps due to the author's peculiar aversion for "polemics". In his preface, Mr. Rubakin says: "Never in my life have I taken part in any polemics, for I believe that in the overwhelming majority of cases polemics are one of the best means of obscuring the truth with all sorts of human emotions." The author does not realise, for one thing, that there has never been, nor can there be, any human *search* for truth without "human emotions". The author forgets, secondly, that he has set out to review "the history of 'ideas'", and the history of ideas is that of the succession, and *consequently* of the *conflict* of ideas.

Book Review (N. A. Rubakin, *Among
Books*, Vol. II Nauka Publishers, Mos-
cow, 1913), Vol. 20, p. 260

COMMENTS ON N. RUBAKIN'S BOOK AMONG THE BOOKS

Among the Books by N. Rubakin

Volume I. Second edition, Moscow.
1911. Linguistics, literature, art,
publicistics, ethics.

* Greek thinkers—Ed.

Ethnography and the Slavonic languages:

Pypin. *A History of Russian Ethnography*. (Volumes I and II—Great Russians. III—Ukrainians, IV—Byelorussians and Siberia). St Petersburg, 1900 (2 r. 50 a volume).

Miklošič. *A Comparative Morphology of the Slavonic Languages*. (Inter alia: Volume III: the Ukrainian and Russian languages (1886) IV: Czech and Polish (1886) (at 1 r. 50 a volume).

T. Florinsky. *Lectures on Slavonic Linguistics*. Parts I and II (3 and 4 rubles), Kiev. 1895 and 1897.

M. Müller. *Lectures on the Science of Language*.

✧ Potebnya. *Thought and Language*. Kharkov. 1894 (2 rubles).

A. Budilovich. *The Slavonic Language*. 2 volumes. Warsaw. 1892.

V. Naumenko. *A Survey of the Phonetic Peculiarities of the Ukrainian Language*. Kiev. 1889. 60 kop.

A. Krymsky: *A Ukrainian Grammar*. Moscow. 1907-8 (2 or 3?) 3 volumes (1.10+0.65+0.60)

Describing publicistic organs, collections and writers, Rubakin writes, inter alia:

"The Narodnik publications ... *Russkoye Bogatstvo* ... Came out in January 1906 under the title *Sovremennye Zapiski* and in March and April of the same year under the title *Sovremennost* (socialist revolutionaries and popular socialists); the publicistic literary weeklies: *Vest* with the publications that replaced it after its closure: *Obshchestvo*, *Mirskiye Vesti*, *Narodnaya Vest*, and *Shchit* (socialist revolutionaries and popular socialists) ...

(Among the Books, volume I second edition, p. 20)

....Listing the B.s* Rubakin calls the following "God-seekers" ²²⁰

V. Bazarov

Bogdanov vol. I.

A. Lunacharsky p. 245

M. Gorky

Written after May 1911

Lenin Miscellany, XXV, pp. 309-31

* Bolsheviks.—*Ed.*

C) LENIN'S KNOWLEDGE OF LANGUAGES

...I am still working in the Königliche Bibliothek * and in the evenings I wander about studying the Berlin mores and listening to German speech. I am now getting used to it and understand it somewhat better than before, but still very, very poorly.

*To His Mother, August 29, 1895,
Vol. 37, p. 78*

...From my own books I must add only *dictionaries*. I am doing a translation from the German and would ask you to send me Pavlovsky's dictionary....

*To His Sister Anna, January 14, 1896,
Vol. 37, pp. 87-88*

Anyuta,

I should like to ask you to get me some English textbooks. I asked for something to translate and have received the Webbs' big book. I am afraid I may make mistakes.

I need (1) an English grammar, especially *syntax*, and especially a section on idioms. If N. K. has not got a Nurok (I think she had one but I do not know if it was hers), send me yours (or Manyasha's) at least for the summer, unless you (or Manyasha) need it. The only thing is that I do not know whether Nurok will give enough on this question. If you could get a good textbook of English it would be a very good thing.

(2) A dictionary of *geographical* and proper names. They are very difficult to translate and transcribe from English and I am very much afraid of making mistakes. I do not know whether suitable dictionaries exist. ... I shall get the German translation and will be able to refer to it.

*To His Mother and His Sister Anna,
March 8, 1898, Vol. 37, p. 166*

When the "markets"²²¹ are finished there is a plan to settle down to the study of languages in general and German in particular. Volodya is ordering Pavlovsky's Russian-German Dictionary from the warehouse and asks Anyuta to get hold of Turgenev in German and a decent German grammar. I

* Royal Library.—Ed.

have heard that one of the best German grammars is that of F. Fiedler but I do not know for sure.

*Krupskaya and Lenin to Lenin's Mother,
December 20, 1898, Vol. 37,
pp. 212-13*

Anyuta apparently did not receive the letter (written a very long time ago) in which I asked her to send me (1) a decent German translation of Turgenev and (2) a detailed German grammar (even one in German for Germans, because those for Russians are usually very brief). I want to make a real study of German. Now I ask you to send me a Russian-German Dictionary, one of those we have at home, Lenström, or better, Reiff's dictionary of Russian and three European languages. I wanted to order Pavlovsky's Russian-German Dictionary from Kalmykova's, but it is being issued in parts and only half of it has appeared.

*To His Mother, February 7, 1899,
Vol. 37, pp. 233-34*

Your irritation at your lack of knowledge of French only impresses upon us the pitiful knowledge of languages that Volodya and I possess—his knowledge is a little better, but mine is very poor. We have got hold of Turgenev in German and intend to start translating from Russian into German, but so far we have neither a dictionary nor a grammar and, even if we had, it is hardly likely we should study. Apparently we shall get to know languages only when we go abroad and necessity forces us to study them seriously.

*Krupskaya and Lenin to Lenin's Sister
Maria, March 7, 1899, Vol. 37, p. 246*

I am still living as usual, I study languages a little, exchange German and Russian lessons with a Czech (conversations rather than lessons) and visit the library.

*To His Sister Maria, November 6, 1900,
Vol. 37, p. 304*

I am sorry I have not studied Czech. It is interesting that it is very much like Polish and contains many old Russian words. I recently went away for a time and when I returned to Prague its Slav character struck me very forcibly—names

ending in *-čik*, *-ček*, etc., words like *lze*, *lekarna*, and so on and so forth.

To His Mother, March 2, 1901,
Vol. 37, p. 322

...I have just written a letter to Mark in which I described in exceptional detail how best to establish a "regime"; as regards mental work, I particularly recommended translations, especially *both ways*—first do a written translation from the foreign language into Russian, then translate it back from Russian into the foreign language. My own experience has taught me that this is the most rational way of learning a language.

To His Sister Maria, May 19, 1901,
Vol. 37, p. 327

Manyasha also writes that she has taken up languages, even English. I thought of sending her a textbook on pronunciation, a very good one, in German. I have been doing some study lately and am very pleased with the book; I can't praise it enough. The book is, Henry Sweet, *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen Englisch*, Oxford, 1901, and it costs something like a ruble twenty-five kopeks. If Manyasha would like me to, I can send it; I do not need it any more. Since she has Toussaint, however, I don't know whether it is worth while, because Toussaint is excellent. I used not to believe in this system but now I am sure it is the only serious, efficient system. If you take a few lessons from a native foreigner after working through the first part of Toussaint you can certainly acquire a thorough knowledge of the language. There are Toussaint dictionaries now as well, in which the *pronunciation is indicated*; I strongly advise Manyasha to buy them because our Alexandrov is *wrong in many cases*. (For instance, I strongly advise her to buy Muret's pocket dictionary that uses the Toussaint method, *Taschenwörterbuch der englischen und deutschen Sprache, Teil I, Englisch-deutsch*, Preis 2 Mark. Berlin, 1902. *Langenscheidtsche Verlagsbuchhandlung*.)

To His Mother, December 17, 1902,
Vol. 37, pp. 352-53

Reply to this letter *without fail* and as soon as possible. It doesn't matter how badly you write Russian. You can even write in Yiddish if you wish.

To I. P. Prutitsky, November 1904,
Vol. 43, p. 137

...Incidentally, I have begun to study Italian and, as a learner, I pounced at once on the address written by Maria Fyodorovna: *expresso* instead of *espresso*! Let's have that dictionary!

To Maxim Gorky and Maria Andreyeva,
January 15, 1908, Vol. 31, p. 373

The local people are Polish peasants, "Hurals" (mountaineers), with whom I converse* in incredibly broken Polish, a language of which I know five words, and the rest in distorted Russian, Nadya speaks a little Polish and can read the language

To His Sister Maria, May 12 or 13,
1913, Vol. 37, p. 496

Radek says that your pamphlet has come out *in English*.²²² I am very glad to hear it—I shall now be able to read and understand it. I understand Dutch to the extent of approximately 30-40%.

To Herman Gorter, May 5, 1915,
Vol. 43 p. 453

* (I prefer talking to Jews—in German).

NOTES

- ¹ The reference is to the materialist definition of matter given by V. I. Lenin. p. 20
- ² *Machists*—followers of Ernst Mach, an Austrian physicist and philosopher, who considered the world as a complex of sensations which the philosopher was to describe. Mach founded a philosophical trend which later became known as empirio-criticism or Machism. Among his followers in Russia were Bogdanov and Bazarov. p. 21
- ³ The *theory of symbols or hieroglyphs*—a theory of knowledge according to which our sensations do not convey images of things or phenomena but mere symbols, signs, having little or nothing in common with the things themselves. This theory contains an element of agnosticism, i.e. the impossibility of knowing the surrounding world. p. 21
- ⁴ *Iskrists*—supporters of *Iskra* (old), the first all-Russia illegal newspaper founded by Lenin. It was published abroad from 1900 to 1903 and played a decisive role in establishing a Marxist party in Russia. p. 23
- ⁵ Lenin's *Philosophical Notebooks* contain conspectuses of and extracts from various books and articles, notes on books and articles dealing with philosophy, and also remarks and notes written in the margin or the text of books on philosophy from Lenin's personal library. The bulk of the material dates back to 1914-15. In these *Notebooks* Lenin is concerned mainly with questions of materialist dialectics, its laws and categories, from which it may be presumed that Lenin intended to write a special book on dialectics but did not actually do so. Lenin had no intention of publishing this material and his notes, especially those in the margin, are often abbreviated and written in the language of the book studied. The texts cited by Lenin, and usually translated, are given in quotes, with the page of the book quoted in brackets. All the markings are Lenin's. p. 25
- ⁶ Feuerbach's book on Leibnitz's philosophy was written in 1836, and additions made in 1847. p. 27
- ⁷ The *Socratics*—followers and disciples of the Greek philosopher Socrates (469-399 B.C.), one of the founders of dialectics as a method of arriving at the truth by means of leading questions. Socrates did not expound his teaching in writing and the main sources for the study of his life and thoughts are the works of his disciples Xenophon (c. 434-355 B.C.) and Plato (427-347 B.C.). p. 37

- ⁸ In a lecture at the Sverdlov University on July 11 1919 Lenin spoke on the origin and essence of the state and the Communist Party's attitude towards it p 43
- ⁹ An allusion to N K Mikhailovsky's criticism of the materialist understanding of history p 45
- ¹⁰ Famous *mais* — but containing a shade of impossibility unfeasibility which cancels out everything said previously p 45
- ¹¹ Criticising Marx for giving in his *Capital* an analysis of only one period of history i.e. capitalist society Mikhailovsky claimed that he himself investigated all periods in the development of human society p 45
- ¹² The reference is to the government statement on the 1896 summer strikes p 46
- ¹³ *Svoboda* (Freedom)—a journal published by a group of Russian emigrants in Switzerland in 1901-02 p 47
- ¹⁴ By freedom of criticism Lenin meant the revision of Marxism begun at the turn of the century by the German Social Democrat Eduard Bernstein and his followers in Russia (the Economists etc p 48
- ¹⁵ This refers to a memorandum of the Ministry of Finance (1902) proposing on behalf of the Russian industrialists to abolish some articles of the law on strikes in which strikers were considered as criminals p 49
- ¹⁶ *Manchester people*—advocates of free trade and of the abolition of laws restricting the development of capitalism p 49
- ¹⁷ The *tsar's manifesto* of February 26 1905 is prompted by the revolution which had started in Russia and was aimed at appeasing public opinion by a promise of reforms p 49
- ¹⁸ Lenin wrote this article in January 1905 while still under the impression of the news about the beginning of a revolution in Russia. At the time Lenin was in emigration in Switzerland p 50
- ¹⁹ *Tryapukhin*—a character from Gogol's comedy *Inspector General*—a typical unprincipled journalist p 51
- ²⁰ *Iskra* (Menshevik new)—a newspaper edited by Martov which was published in Geneva from 1903 to 1905. It was in the opinion of the opportunist section of the RSDLP. It was called *new* to distinguish it from the *old Iskra* published by Lenin from 1900 to 1903 p 51
- ²¹ *Constitutional Democratic Party* (Cadets)—the chief party of the liberal monarchist bourgeoisie in Russia founded in 1905. Its main aim is to establish a constitutional monarchy p 52

The new *Iskra* supporters—Menshevik adherents of the new *Iskra*. The Caucasian conference of the Mensheviks held in 1905 discussed the question of the provisional revolutionary government in the context of the bourgeois democratic revolution which had begun in Russia. Lenin and the Bolsheviks held that a provisional revolutionary government could be set up in the course of the revolution and that the

Social-Democrats could be allowed to participate in it. The Mensheviks were against participation in the government. p. 52

- ²³ This refers to the resolution of September 15, 1872 which stated: "Any political organisation of the so-called provisional of revolutionary authority would be only a new fraud and would prove as dangerous to the proletariat as all the present-day governments." In July 1873 a bourgeois revolution broke out in Spain. The workers, led by the Bakuninists, lacked proper organisation and feared to take power in their own hands; the revolution was a failure. p. 52

- ²⁴ *Mensheviks* and *Bolsheviks*—the opportunist and the revolutionary trend in Russian Social-Democracy. During the elections of the Party central bodies at the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1903) the revolutionary Social-Democrats headed by Lenin received the majority of votes; hence their name Bolsheviks, from the Russian word "bolshinstvo" meaning majority. The opportunists were in the minority and became known as Mensheviks, from the Russian word "menshinstvo" meaning minority. p. 53

- ²⁵ This refers to the slogans put forward by Lenin during the 1905-07 revolution in Russia calling for the establishment of a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry and the organisation of a provisional revolutionary government. p. 54

- ²⁶ *Manilov*—a character in Gogol's *Dead Souls*, an easy-going sentimental landowner. The name has become symbolical of the idle weak-willed dreamer. p. 55

- ²⁷ "*Divisionists*"—a group of Russian Social-Democrats who at the Fourth Party Congress (1906) demanded the confiscation of landed estates and their division among the peasants. Lenin and the Bolsheviks were for nationalising the landed estates and handing them over to elective peasant committees. p. 56

- ²⁸ The *Duma*—a representative assembly which the tsarist government was forced to convene following the revolutionary events of 1905. Nominally it was a legislative body but actually it had no real power. Elections to the Duma were neither direct, nor equal, nor universal. The Duma merely proposed bills which, were subsequently discussed by the reactionary Council of State, the right to endorse bills belonged to the tsar. p. 57

- ²⁹ In this article Plekhanov polemises with the Poltava Social-Democratic newspaper *Kolokol* (The Bell) (1906). Analysing the tactics of the Social-Democrats in the Duma the newspaper advocated independent action for the Social-Democratic group which was to defend the interests of the workers and to unmask the tendency of the Cadet majority to compromise with the government. p. 57

- ³⁰ The reference is to the appeal to the people in connection with the discussion of the agrarian question in the First Duma. In the appeal the government declared outright that it would never allow confiscation of the landed estates and that the agrarian question should be settled by the government, not the Duma. p. 58

- ³¹ This refers to the liberal journalists. p. 58
- ³² In an article printed in the liberal newspaper *Tovarishch* (Comrade) in December 1906 the Menshevik Vasilyev called on the Social-Democratic Party to support the bourgeois Cadet Party during the elections to the Second Duma. Up till 1905 Vasilyev had been an émigré in Switzerland. p. 60
- ³³ The *Socialist-Revolutionaries*—a party of the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie formed in Russia at the end of 1901 and beginning of 1902. They did not see the class differences between the proletariat and the peasantry, glossed over the class stratification among the peasants. They applied the tactics of individual terrorism in their struggle against tsarism. Their agrarian programme envisaged the abolition of private ownership of land, its transfer to the village communes, egalitarian land tenure and development of cooperation: they were in favour of developing small-scale commodity production. The Bolsheviks exposed the S.R.s as petty-bourgeois socialists but at the same time came to terms with them in the struggle against tsarism. After the October Socialist Revolution of 1917 the Left-wing S.R.s entered the Soviet Government (up till July 1918), while the Right wing adopted the line of struggle against Soviet power. p. 60
- ³⁴ *Trudoviki*—a group of petty-bourgeois democrats in the Duma composed of peasants and intellectuals of the Narodnik trend. They demanded the abolition of all social estate and national restrictions, democratic local government, universal franchise and liquidation of landed estates. In the Duma the Trudoviks vacillated between the Cadets and the Social-Democrats. Since they represented the peasant masses, the Bolsheviks pursued the tactics of agreeing with them on some questions. p. 61
- ³⁵ The reference is to the opportunist agitation for the substitution of an "open" workers' organisation for the illegal working-class party, whose activities would be allowed by the tsarist government p. 61
- ³⁶ This refers to a passage from Lenin's pamphlet *The St. Petersburg Elections and the Hypocrisy of the Thirty-One-Mensheviks* in which he accused the Mensheviks of splitting the St. Petersburg Social-Democratic organisation. The Party Central Committee, which was composed of Mensheviks, accused Lenin of behaving in a manner incompatible with membership of the party in that he had published this fact in the press. They held that this undermined the prestige of the Social-Democratic Party among the workers. p. 62
- ³⁷ *Bez Zaglaviya* group—a group of Russian bourgeois intellectuals who rallied around the political weekly *Bez Zaglaviya* (Without a Title) (January-May 1906). They professed bourgeois liberalism and opportunism. p. 63
- ³⁸ *Tovarishch* (Comrade)—a Left-wing Cadet newspaper published in Petersburg in 1906-07. The *Bez Zaglaviya* people contributed to it after the closure of the *Bez Zaglaviya* journal. p. 63
- ³⁹ Lenin quotes passages from a speech of Kiselyov, a Trudovik peasant, at

- the 26th sitting of the Second Duma (April 12, 1907). p. 64
- 40 The *Convention*—the French National Assembly formed as a result of the popular uprising of August 10, 1792. The Convention abolished feudalism and ruthlessly suppressed all counter-revolutionary and conciliatory elements. p. 64
- 41 The *otzovists*—a group of Bolshevik Social-Democrats formed in 1908, who demanded the recall of the Social-Democrat deputies from the Duma and cessation of work in legal workers' organisations which led to isolation from the masses and to sectarianism. p. 67
- 42 The *minimum programme*—demands of the Social-Democratic Party which were feasible under capitalism; overthrow of tsarism, establishment of a democratic republic, eight-hour working day, etc. p. 67
- 43 The reference is to P. N. Milyukov's article "The Political Parties in the Country and in the Duma". p. 67
- 44 *Octobrists*—members of the Union of October Seventeen, a counter-revolutionary party which represented the interests of the big bourgeoisie and landowners who ran their estates on capitalist lines. It was formed in October 1905 and supported entirely the policy of the tsarist government. p. 67
- 45 *Die Neue Zeit* (New Times)—a theoretical journal of the German Social-Democratic Party, published in Stuttgart from 1883 to 1923. From the second half of the 1890s it began to publish regularly articles by revisionists, including Russians.
- Trotsky's and Martov's articles published in 1910 in Nos. 50 and 51 respectively distorted the real meaning of the struggle within the Party and the history of the 1905-07 revolution in Russia. The journal refused to publish Lenin's reply. p. 68
- 46 The *Taurida Palace* in Petersburg (now Leningrad) was the building where the Duma held its sittings. p. 70
- 47 *Liquidators*—an opportunist trend in the R.S.D.L.P., Right-wing Mensheviks, formed in 1907. They demanded the liquidation of the illegal revolutionary working-class party and proposed to organise a legal reformist party. In 1912 the liquidators were expelled from the Party. p. 71
- 48 The reference is to the leading article of the Menshevik liquidator newspaper *Pravda*, published in Vienna from 1908 to 1912 and edited by Trotsky. p. 71
- 49 The Regulations of June 12, 1900 envisaged to transfer of food relief to the starving population of Russia from the jurisdiction of the Zemstvo organisations to that of government bodies.
- Zemstvos*—local self-government bodies headed by nobility. They were set up in the central gubernias of tsarist Russia in 1864. Their powers were confined to purely local economic problems. p. 72
- 50 *Russkiye Vedomosti* (Russian Recorder)—a daily newspaper published in Moscow from 1863 to 1917 by liberal professors and Zemstvo officials. It expressed the interests of the liberal landowners and bourgeoisie. p. 72

- ⁵¹ The liberal journalist Vodovozov expounded Narodnik views on the possibility of combining in one party representatives of three social classes in the tsarist Russia: peasants, workers and "working intelligentsia". Lenin argued against that because the peasantry and the working class occupied different positions in society and had different aims of struggle. The working class wanted to do away with wage slavery by overthrowing bourgeois rule, and the peasantry, as a class of small owners, put forward general democratic demands which did not affect bourgeois rule. p. 73
- ⁵² *Nationalists*—members of the nationalistic parties in the Duma. p. 73
- ⁵³ *Novoye Vremya* (New Times)—a daily newspaper published in St Petersburg from 1868 to 1917. After 1876, when A. S. Suvorin became its publisher, it was the organ of bureaucratic and aristocratic circles, a symbol of the venal press. p. 73
- ⁵⁴ The speeches of Purishkevich, Markov and other monarchist deputies in the Duma were notable for their numerous obscenities. p. 74
- ⁵⁵ The *Council of State*—one of the highest state bodies in tsarist Russia, consisted of elected representatives of the nobility, clergy and big bourgeoisie and dignitaries appointed by the tsar. This composition of the Council of State ensured that it followed a reactionary political line; it rejected even the most moderate bills discussed in the Duma. p. 74
- ⁵⁶ Lenin quotes Kolomyansky, the Right-wing leader in the Council of State. p. 74
- ⁵⁷ *A wild landlord*—a title character in a tale by Saltykov-Shchedrin, a typical feudal landowner who cruelly exploited his serf peasants. p. 74
- ⁵⁸ *Narodniks*—representatives of a petty-bourgeois trend in the Russian revolutionary movement which arose in the 1870s. The Narodniks denied the development of capitalist relations in Russia and therefore considered the peasantry and not the proletariat to be the main revolutionary force; they regarded the village commune as the embryo of socialism. In their efforts to rouse the peasants to rebel against the tsarist autocracy the Narodniks used to go to the villages, i.e. "among the people" (hence their name) but they found no support there.
- Narodism passed through several stages: from revolutionary democracy to liberalism. At the end of the nineteenth century the Narodniks tried to reconcile with tsarism, they expressed the interests of the rich peasants, and waged struggle against Marxism. N. K. Mikhailovsky, N. F. Danielson and S. N. Yuzhakov were ideologists of liberal Narodism. p. 75
- ⁵⁹ Lenin took the description of the Russian village from the liberal Narodnik journal *Russkoye Bogatstvo* (Russian Wealth). p. 75
- ⁶⁰ *Tolstoyism*—ethical teaching of the Russian writer and thinker Leo Tolstoy, who preached "universal love", non-resistance to evil by violence, religious and moral self-perfection as a means of changing society. p. 75
- ⁶¹ This is an allusion to the opposition of the landowners to the oil magnates who artificially raised the price of oil. p. 76

- ⁶² The reference is to the revolution of 1905-07. p. 78
- ⁶³ *Christian socialism*—a trend of social thought which tried to give the Christian religion a socialist tinge. p. 78
- ⁶⁴ On April 24 (May 5), 1914, twenty-four deputies of the Fourth Duma (Social-Democrats and Trudoviks) were expelled for fifteen sittings. p. 79
- ⁶⁵ This refers to the manifesto "To the Proletarians of Europe" adopted at the International Socialist Conference which took place in Zimmerwald (Switzerland) between September 5 and 8, 1915; it was attended by delegates of eleven European countries. The Left Social-Democrats moved their draft resolution on war and the tasks of Social-Democrats which was rejected by the Centrist majority. p. 79
- ⁶⁶ The *Second International*—an international association of socialist parties which existed from 1889 to 1914. When the First World War (1914-18) broke out the Second International dissolved because its leaders betrayed internationalism and sided with their imperialist governments. p. 80
- ⁶⁷ *Plekhanov, Hyndman and Kautsky* were the leaders of the Second International. During the First World War they became social-chauvinists and supported the "defence of the fatherland" slogan in the imperialist war. p. 80
- ⁶⁸ *Rabocheye Utro*—a legal Menshevik newspaper, published in Petrograd from October to December 1915. p. 80
- ⁶⁹ *Repetilov*—a character from Griboyedov's *Wit Works Woe*, an unprincipled man, a braggart and windbag, who repeats other people's words and thoughts. p. 80
- ⁷⁰ *War industries committees* were set up in 1915 by big bourgeoisie to aid the tsarist government in carrying on war. Trying to instil defenceist sentiment into the workers the bourgeoisie organised the "workers' groups" within these committees. p. 81
- ⁷¹ The *London Conference of Socialists* of the Triple Entente countries took place in February 1915. It was attended by social-chauvinists and pacifists of Great Britain, France, Belgium and Russia. The Bolsheviks who were not invited to the conference made a declaration in which they demanded that socialists should withdraw from the governments and struggle resolutely against the imperialist war. p. 81
- ⁷² This refers to the conference of German and Austrian socialists which took place in Vienna in April 1915. It was convened in response to the London Conference of Socialists of the Triple Entente countries and approved in its resolution of the social-chauvinist slogan of "defence of the fatherland" in the imperialist war. p. 81
- ⁷³ Lenin wrote *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* in Switzerland in the spring of 1916. The Preface was written in April 1917 after the February bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia which overthrew autocracy. p. 82
- ⁷⁴ *Courland*—the old name of the parts of the Baltic provinces lying west and southwest of the Gulf of Riga. p. 83

- ⁷⁵ *Junius*—the pen name of Rosa Luxemburg (1871-1919), a prominent leader of the German, Polish and international working-class movement, an ardent fighter against militarism and opportunism. Her pamphlet *The Crisis of Social-Democracy* was devoted to the analysis and criticism of Social-Democrats' activities. p. 83
- ⁷⁶ *Internationale*—a journal of German revolutionary Social-Democrats published in 1915. p. 83
- ⁷⁷ In his article "Proletariat and 'the Right of Nations to Self-Determination' in the Epoch of Finance Capital" P. Kievsky tried to prove that under imperialism the right of nations to self-determination is unattainable and therefore this slogan should not be put forward. Lenin gives an example of Norway which ceded from Sweden in 1905 after a referendum. p. 83
- ⁷⁸ Lenin refers to the proclamation "To the Socialists of the World" adopted on April 30 (May 13), 1917. Condemning in words the world war as a hideous crime, it stated that the war on the part of Russia (after the autocracy had been overthrown in February 1917) ceased to be an imperialist one, and called upon all the soldiers to defend the cause of revolution and carry on war to a victorious end. It also stated that the bourgeois Provisional Government allegedly took the stand of peace without annexations and indemnities and accepted the principle of self-determination of nations. p. 84
- ⁷⁹ *Ministerialism*—the name given to the followers of French socialist Millerand, who became minister of the reactionary bourgeois government in 1899. Russian ministerialists—Mensheviks and S.R.s—entered the bourgeois Provisional Government in 1917 p. 85
- ⁸⁰ This refers to the Note of the British and French governments in which they welcomed the decision of the Provisional Government to continue war and justified their own participation in it. p. 85
- ⁸¹ *Dyelo Naroda* (People's Cause)—an organ of the Socialist-Revolutionary party, published in Petrograd from March 1917 to July 1918. p. 85
- ⁸² The article was directed against the "Left Communists" (1918) who opposed the conclusion of the Brest peace treaty with Germany and were for a "revolutionary war". Though the Brest peace treaty was concluded in March 1918 on very harsh terms for Russia, it gave it a breathing space after three and a half years of war, and made it possible to demobilise the old tsarist army and start building a new Red army. Lenin understood that it was a temporary breathing space and that at the slightest change in the international and internal situation Germany could start war again. This was a forced compromise. The "Left Communists" considered any compromise, any agreement with imperialists a betrayal of revolution. p. 87
- ⁸³ The reference is to the armies of Britain and France (tsarist Russia's allies in the First World War of 1914-18) who after the October Socialist Revolution started an armed intervention against Soviet Russia. p. 88
- ⁸⁴ See Note 65. p. 88

- ⁸⁵ Lenin has in mind the Berne conference of social-chauvinist and Centrist socialist parties held in February 1919 with a view of re-establishing the Second International. p. 88
- ⁸⁶ *Spartacists*—a revolutionary organisation of German Left Social-Democrats set up in January 1916. It carried propaganda work, organised anti-war actions, exposed chauvinist sentiment in the masses. p. 89
- ⁸⁷ *Poshekhonye*—synonym for an out-of-the-way provincial town where wild patriarchal mores and customs reigned supreme; the expression was widely current after the publication of M. Y. Saltykov-Shchedrin's novel *Old Times in Poshekhonye*. p. 89
- ⁸⁸ In the article "The Third International" the British social-reformist Ramsay MacDonald called for the unity of social-chauvinists and revolutionary Social-Democrats. p. 91
- ⁸⁹ *Volapük*—an artificial international language invented by F. Schleyer in 1880, figuratively—a mere verbiage and gibberish. p. 92
- ⁹⁰ *Ophen* dialect (also *Galivon*, *Matroisk*)—a language of travelling small traders who invented it in order to communicate with each other. p. 94
- ⁹¹ This point was introduced by Lenin into the programme of the R.S.D.L.P. during the discussion of the draft programme at the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1903) p. 94
- ⁹² The *Organising Committee* for the convocation of the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1903) usurped the powers of the Credentials Commission. p. 94
- ⁹³ *Bundists*—members of the *Bund* (the General Jewish Workers' Union of Lithuania, Poland and Russia) which was founded in 1897 and consisted mainly of semi-proletarian sections of Jewish artisans of Western Russia. The Bund advocated nationalism and separatism within the Russian and international working-class movement, and pursued an opportunist policy in the R.S.D.L.P. In 1921 the Bund dissolved itself. p. 94
- ⁹⁴ *P.S.P.* (*Polska Partia Socjalistyczna*)—the Polish Socialist Party—a reformist nationalist party founded in 1892. Acting under the slogan of struggle for independent Poland it carried on separatist nationalist propaganda among the Polish workers, trying to divert them from joint struggle with the Russian workers against autocracy and capitalism. p. 95
- ⁹⁵ This refers to the Bund's demand to be recognised as a sole representative of the Jewish proletariat. p. 96
- ⁹⁶ The *Lena Goldfields*, situated on the Lena River in Siberia, were owned by the British and Russian shareholders, among whom were members of the tsar's family. p. 100
- ⁹⁷ The *August 1912 Conference* attended by representatives of all the opportunist trends in the R.S.D.L.P. (Mensheviks, liquidators, Bundists and others) voted against the illegal proletarian party. p. 100
- ⁹⁸ The *Copenhagen Congress of the Second International* was held in August 1910. p. 102

- ⁹⁹ *Russkaya Molva* (Russian Idings)—a daily newspaper of the bourgeois Progressist Party was published in St. Petersburg in 1912-13 p. 104
- ¹⁰⁰ *Progressists* ('Progressist Party')—a party of big bourgeoisie in Russia existed from 1912 to 1917 p. 104
- ¹⁰¹ *Narodova Demokracja*—a reactionary nationalist party of Polish land owners and bourgeoisie organised in 1897 preached militant nationalism and chauvinism p. 104
- ¹⁰² This is the plan of Lenin's essay on the national question which he read in Swiss towns in July 1913 p. 109
- ¹⁰³ *Personal autonomy* i.e. territorial autonomy p. 110
- ¹⁰⁴ The *Brunn Congress of Austrian Social Democrats* was held in September 1899 p. 110
- ¹⁰⁵ This was the name given by Marx and Engels to the followers of the German petty bourgeois socialist Ferdinand Lassalle who professed introduction of socialism in Prussia with the help of the royal government p. 114
- ¹⁰⁶ The reference is to Lenin's article 'Liberals and Democrats on the Language Question' published in the legal Bolshevik newspaper *Svet azh Pravda* in 1913 p. 115
- ¹⁰⁷ Lenin names here members of the counter-revolutionary bourgeois parties in Russia p. 116
- ¹⁰⁸ The *Beilis Case*—the trial of the Jew Beilis in Kiev (1913). Beilis was falsely accused of the ritual murder of the Christian boy. The trial was staged by the tsarist government and members of the Black Hundreds. It aroused strong protest of the progressive public in Russia. Beilis was acquitted by the court p. 121
- ¹⁰⁹ *Dzim* (The Bell)—a legal nationalist monthly magazine published in Ukrainian in Kiev in 1913-14 p. 122
- ¹¹⁰ This refers to the census of primary schools in Russia p. 129
- ¹¹¹ *Zhmud*—the language of the historical region Zemaitė—the north-western part of Lithuania; a dialect of Lithuanian. Lenin used it here in the sense of Lithuanian language p. 130
- ¹¹² *Chud* (obsolete)—modern Estonian p. 130
- ¹¹³ *Iapp*—modern Saami, one of the languages of the Ugro-Finnish group p. 130
- ¹¹⁴ *Zyryan*—modern Komi, one of the languages of the Ugro-Finnish group p. 130
- ¹¹⁵ *Samoyed* (obsolete)—modern Samodhi languages— a group of related languages which includes those of Nentsi, Entsi, Nganasan and Selkups p. 130
- ¹¹⁶ *Peredonovism*—after Peredonov, a type of teacher spy and dull bout from the Russian writer Sologub's novel *The Petty Demon* p. 131

- ¹¹⁷ *Pro-Party Mensheviks*—a trend in Menshevism which sprang up in 1908. They opposed liquidationism and advocated illegal R.S.D.L.P.; carried party work jointly with the Bolsheviks. During the First World War (1914-18) the majority of the pro-Party Mensheviks became defencists. p. 132
- ¹¹⁸ *Pravda* (Truth)—a legal Bolshevik paper published in St. Petersburg from 1912, central organ of the CPSU from 1917. p. 132
- ¹¹⁹ *Black Hundreds*—monarchist gangs of declassed elements were organised by the tsarist police to fight the revolutionary movement. They murdered revolutionaries, attacked progressive intellectuals and staged Jewish pogroms. p. 134
- ¹²⁰ Lenin had in mind the reactionary newspaper *Novoye Vremya* (New Times); Menshikov was one of its contributors. p. 135
- ¹²¹ Lenin names Russian writers and literary critics whose writings exerted great influence on Russian and world culture. p. 135
- ¹²² A thesis from Lenin's lecture on the national question which he read in Paris in January 1914. p. 136
- ¹²³ See pp. 136-37 of this book. p. 136
- ¹²⁴ See Note 62. p. 138
- ¹²⁵ *Polish koto*—an association of Polish deputies in the Duma (in the main—representatives of nationalist bourgeoisie). p. 138
- ¹²⁶ *Za Pravdu* (For Truth)—one of the titles which the legal Bolshevik newspaper *Pravda* carried in 1913. p. 140
- ¹²⁷ *Napoleonic wars*—wars fought by France in the period of the Consulate (1799-1804) and Napoleon's I Empire (1804-14, 1815) p. 142
- ¹²⁸ National wars at the end of the eighteenth-beginning of the nineteenth century which accompanied the setting up of national states. p. 143
- ¹²⁹ *Decembrists*—Russian revolutionary noblemen, who rose in revolt against autocracy on December 14, 1825. The revolt was crushed by tsarist troops, its participants were executed or sentenced to hard labour in Siberia. p. 144
- ¹³⁰ This refers to participants in the revolutionary movement of the 1870s who carried on revolutionary propaganda among the peasants and fought autocracy by terroristic action. p. 144
- ¹³¹ The *Cultural and national autonomy*—a nationalist theory propounded by the Austrian Social-Democrats Karl Renner and Otto Bauer at the beginning of the twentieth century. The national question was reduced to attainment of national self-government limited to cultural problems, school and language (see pp. ... of this book). p. 145
- ¹³² The reference is to the bourgeois Provisional Government, set up in Russia after the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution. p. 148
- ¹³³ See Note 86. p. 150
- ¹³⁴ *Independents*—members of the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany—a Centrist party formed in April 1917; it advocated unity

with social-chauvinists.

p. 150

- ¹³⁵ The programme of the R.S.D.L.P. adopted by the Second Congress (1903) consisted of two parts: the minimum programme contained demands which could be fulfilled in the bourgeois-democratic revolution: the overthrow of autocracy, establishment of a republic, eight-hour working day, etc.; the maximum programme formulated the ultimate aims of the working-class struggle: socialist revolution, establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, building of socialism. p. 151
- ¹³⁶ This refers to the *Triple Entente*—the imperialist bloc of Britain, France and tsarist Russia which took final shape in 1907. During the First World War it was joined by more than twenty countries. After the October Socialist Revolution the countries of the Triple Entente organised an armed intervention against Soviet Russia. p. 151
- ¹³⁷ Here Lenin means Kazakhs. p. 152
- ¹³⁸ An allusion is to Lenin's proposals to unify Soviet Republics into the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics. p. 159
- ¹³⁹ Lenin had in mind the views of the revolutionary democrats Chernyshevsky, Dobrolubov, Pisarev and others. p. 161
- ¹⁴⁰ *Rabocheye Dyelo* (Worker's Cause)—a journal published by the Russian Bernsteinians in Geneva from 1899 to 1902. p. 161
- ¹⁴¹ This refers to an illegal working-class party p. 162
- ¹⁴² The reference is to the members of the Russian revolutionary terrorist organisation People's Will. p. 162
- ¹⁴³ This refers to Martov's formulation of § 1 of the Party Rules on Party membership which he proposed to the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1903) and which was adopted by majority vote. It stated: "A member of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party is one who accepts its programme, supports the Party financially, and renders it regular personal assistance under the direction of one of its organisations." Lenin's formulation stated that Party membership should be determined not by personal assistance but by obligatory participation in one of the Party organisations. p. 163
- ¹⁴⁴ See Note 34. p. 165
- ¹⁴⁵ The *gubernia committees of landlords* were set up with the aim of drawing up preliminary drafts of the 1861 peasant reform. They tried to retain the landowners' privileges as much as possible. Best lands which had previously been used by peasants were cut off and handed over to big landowners. p. 166
- ¹⁴⁶ *Civil mediators*—officials who during the 1861 peasant reform, which abolished serfdom in Russia, were appointed from among the aristocrats to settle disputes between peasants and landowners and had juridical and police power over peasants. p. 166
- ¹⁴⁷ This refers to peasant bourgeois democrats who were dissatisfied with irresoluteness of the Duma. p. 166
- ¹⁴⁸ See Note 44. p. 166

- ¹⁴⁹ Members of the Cadet Party (see Note 21). p. 166
- ¹⁵⁰ Here Lenin defines contradictions in Leo Tolstoy's works. (On Tolstoyism see Note 60). p. 167
- ¹⁵¹ See Note 4. p. 169
- ¹⁵² *Economists*—representatives of an opportunist trend in Russian Social-Democracy at the turn of the century who strove to limit the working-class movement to economic struggle and maintained that political struggle should be waged by liberal bourgeoisie. p. 170
- ¹⁵³ See Note 93. p. 170
- ¹⁵⁴ The *events on the Lena* took place on April 17 (4), 1912. The tsarist troops shot a peaceful demonstration of strikers who protested against the arrest of strike committee members in the Lena Goldfields in Siberia. These events were followed by strikes all over Russia. p. 170
- ¹⁵⁵ Here the reference is to the split which occurred in 1912 between Plekhanov who headed a group of pro-Party Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks who strove for strengthening the illegal party. p. 171
- ¹⁵⁶ See Note 118. p. 171
- ¹⁵⁷ This refers to the Menshevik newspaper *Izvestia Petrogradskogo Sovieta Rabochich i Soldatskich Deputatov* (*Izvestia* of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies) and the organ of the petty-bourgeois S.R. Party *Dyelo Naroda* (*People's Cause*). p. 172
- ¹⁵⁸ The reference is to the draft Party Programme proposed by a group of Moscow Bolsheviks. p. 173
- ¹⁵⁹ This refers to Lenin's article "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" written in March 1918 and his "Report on the Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" delivered at the sitting of All-Russia C.E.C. on April 29, 1918. p. 174
- ¹⁶⁰ The *Shop Stewards Committees*—elected working-class organisations which were set up in Britain during the First World War to counterbalance trade unions and which headed workers' actions against the war. p. 175
- ¹⁶¹ i.e. Britain, France and their Allies. p. 175
- ¹⁶² *Bagmen*—people who during the Civil War in Russia profiteered in food products. p. 175
- ¹⁶³ By the decree of March 16, 1919 the Council of People's Commissars reorganised the consumers' cooperatives of the Republic and named them "consumers' communes". The new name led the peasants to misinterpretation of the decree. Taking this fact into consideration the All-Russia C.E.C., in its decision of June 30, 1919, changed the name of consumers' commune to consumers' society, a more usual one. p. 178
- ¹⁶⁴ *Subbotnik* (from Russian *subbota*—Saturday) was first organised in Soviet Russia on Saturday, May 10, 1919. p. 179
- ¹⁶⁵ Lenin has in mind his pamphlet *On Tax in Kind*. p. 181
- ¹⁶⁶ This refers to the draft resolution on participation of the Communist

International in a conference of all workers' parties of the Second (see Note 66) and Two-and-a-Half Internationals

The Two-and-a-Half International—an international association of the Centrist parties which withdrew from the Second International under the pressure of the masses p 182

167 Lenin suggested that the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection should be combined with the Party Central Control Commission p 183

168 i.e. well-to-do peasants p 184

169 This refers to the diagram illustrating the development of capitalism in breadth given by the author of the revised article p 184

170 The name given to liberal Narodniks (see Note 55) in the Russian publicist writings p 184

171 *Russkaya Mysl* (Russian Thought)—a monthly journal of the liberal Narodnik trend; it was published in Moscow from 1880 to 1918 p 185

172 The reference is to the author of an unsigned article which was published in the journal *Otechestvennyye Zapiski* (Fatherland Chronicle) for 1879 and defended progressive sides of the Narodniks teaching p 185

173 B. O. Ephrussi could not understand that Sismond's theory was petty-bourgeois and reactionary because while criticising capitalism it sought models in old order and traditions which did not correspond to contemporary economic conditions p 186

174 *Rabochaya Mysl* (Workers' Thought)—a newspaper of the so-called Economists (see Note 152) an opportunist trend in the Russian Social-Democracy at the turn of the century. It was published from 1897 to 1902 p 186

175 The reference is to the conference held by the Mensheviks in Geneva in 1905 where they determined their tactics in the 1905-07 revolution in Russia p 189

176 *Octobrists and the Party of Peaceful Renovation*—parties of big bourgeois in Russia p 190

177 See Note 33 p 191

178 The *Paris Commune of 1871*—the first proletarian revolution and the first working-class government which existed in Paris from March 18 to May 28, 1871 p 197

179 In March (February old style) 1917 a bourgeois democratic revolution which overthrew autocracy took place in Russia p 198

180 This refers to Karl Kautsky's work *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat* published in 1918 p 201

181 See Note 85 p 204

182 Lenin refers to Bukharin's and Trotsky's theses which they put forward during the discussion on trade unions in 1910 p 205

183 In his book *Critical Remarks on the Subject of Russia's Economic Development*

- P. B. Struve criticised Narodism from the liberal bourgeois stand.
p. 209
- 184 The reference is to S. N. Yuzhakov's Article "Educational Problems".
p. 209
- 185 This refers to a utopian plan of introducing under tsarism obligatory universal secondary education proposed by S. N. Yuzhakov.
p. 209
- 186 The *Erfurt programme* of the German Social-Democratic Party adopted in 1891 was critically analysed by F. Engels in his work: *A Critique of the Draft Social-Democratic Programme*.
p. 213
- 187 See Note 50.
p. 214
- 188 On Lenin's proposal G. V. Plekhanov wrote the first draft of the theoretical programme of the R.S.D.L.P. at the beginning of 1902. Lenin wrote critical remarks to it. The draft was reworked by Plekhanov and discussed by the *Iskra* editorial board. Lenin's remarks published here were written after he had read the second draft in the spring of 1902.
p. 215
- 189 Lenin has in mind the second draft programme of the R.S.D.L.P. written by G. V. Plekhanov.
p. 216
- 190 The *Mountain* and *Gironde*—two political groups of the bourgeoisie at the time of the French Revolution. The Mountain was the name given to the most determined representatives of the bourgeoisie who advocated the abolition of absolutism and feudalism. Girondists wavered between revolution and counter-revolution and entered into deals with monarchy.
p. 217
- 191 This is the draft programme of the R.S.D.L.P. drawn up by the Committee appointed by the *Iskra* editorial board to draw a single draft programme based on the drafts written by Lenin and Plekhanov. All members of the editorial board were to make their remarks on this draft. Lenin made his remarks in the margin of the Committee's draft.
p. 218
- 192 *Pre-Raphaelitism*—a romantic trend in the English art in the mid-nineteenth century.
p. 225
- 193 This refers to Volumes II and III of Marx's *Capital*.
p. 226
- 194 The reference is to the discussion on the attitude towards the Duma the convocation of which was announced in the tsar's manifesto of October 17, 1905.
p. 228
- 195 The *Parvusites*—followers of Parvus (1869-1924), member of the Russian and German Social-Democratic movement, Menshevik.
p. 228
- 196 See Note 21.
p. 230
- 197 See Note 34.
p. 230
- 198 The *labour congress*—an opportunist slogan to replace an illegal Social-Democratic party by a broad non-party organisation which was to carry on only legal activities permitted by the tsarist government.
p. 230

- 199 Lenin names Russian liberal public figures who preached Bernsteinianism in the working-class movement. p. 231
- 200 The resolution of the Fifth Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1907) on the attitude of the Social-Democracy to bourgeois parties. p. 232
- 201 *Nasha Zarya* (Our Dawn)—a legal journal of the Menshevik liquidators published in St. Petersburg from 1910 to 1911. p. 235
- 202 The Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P.—the newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat* published abroad from 1908 to 1917. p. 235
- 203 This refers to Lenin's article "On the Election Platform" which he planned to publish in *Pravda*. Vitimsky (M. S. Olmsky) was its editor-in-chief at the time. p. 236
- 204 The *Democratic Conference* was convened in Petrograd in September 1917 to solve the question of power. Representatives of petty-bourgeois and bourgeois organisations took part in its work. The Conference approved of the bourgeois Provisional Government's policy. p. 238
- 205 Lenin means Yermansky's book *The Taylor System and the Scientific Organisation of Labour*, published in 1922. p. 241
- 206 Lenin criticised the Russian translation of Hertz's book: *Die agrarischen Fragen im Verhältniss zum Sozialismus*. p. 242
- 207 The reference is to an introductory article by F. Engels: "On the History of the Communist League" to Marx's work: *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne*. p. 243
- 208 In December 1905. p. 243
- 209 *Polyarnaya Zvezda* (Polar Star)—a journal of the Right-wing Cadets published in 1905-06 and directed against revolutionary-democratic intellectuals. p. 243
- 210 The *International Socialist Bureau*—a permanent information and executive body of the Second International. p. 244
- 211 The *Independent Labour Party* of Britain—a reformist party, organised in 1893. From its inception it devoted much attention to parliamentary forms of struggle. p. 244
- 212 Chernov criticises Plekhanov's translation of Engels' work *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*. p. 244
- 213 The *Gotha Programme*—the programme of the German Social-Democratic Party adopted in 1875. Engels criticised the draft Gotha programme in his letter to A. Bebel of March 18-28, 1875; and Marx—in a letter to W. Bracke, a leader of the German Social-Democratic Party. p. 247
- 214 Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*. p. 247
- 215 See Note 178. p. 248
- 216 The *Osvobozhdeniye League* members were bourgeois liberals who grouped around the journal *Osvobozhdeniye* (published abroad from 1902 to 1905). In 1905 they set up the Cadet Party. p. 251

- ²¹⁷ The reference is to the Menshevik Parvus' article "Social-Democracy and the State Duma". p. 251
- ²¹⁸ The *Organising Committee*—the leading body of the Mensheviks formed in 1912; held social-chauvinist stand. p. 251
- ²¹⁹ A department of the People's Commissariat for Education. p. 253
- ²²⁰ The *god-seekers*—representatives of a religious-philosophical trend which arouse among certain Party intellectuals after the defeat of the 1905-07 revolution. They sought to create new, "socialist" religion. p. 263
- ²²¹ The reference is to Lenin's work *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*. p. 264
- ²²² This refers to the pamphlet by the Dutch Social-Democrat Gorter: *Imperialism, World War and Social-Democracy*, written in 1914 and directed against opportunism. p. 267

NAME INDEX

A

- Akimov Vladimir Petrovich* (1872-1921)—Russian Social Democrat extreme opportunist. During the Second Congress of the RSDLP (1905) opposed the Marxist programme worked out by editorial board of the Leninist *Iskra*—23-226
- An—Jordana A. A.* (1870-1953)—leader of the Georgian Menshevik liquidators—132-33
- Andreyeva Maria Fyodorovna* (1868-1953)—Russian actress. Maxim Gorky's wife by civil marriage—267
- Anyuta*—see *Ulanova Yelena A. I.*—265
- Arenarius Richard* (1813-1896)—German philosopher, subjective idealist, formulated fundamental principles of empirio-criticism—167-193

B

- Bauer Otto* (1882-1938)—a leader of Austrian Social Democrats and the Second International, ideologue of Austrian Marxism—122-23-145
- Bazarov Vladimir Alexandrovich* (1874-1939)—Russian Social Democrat, philosopher and economist, represented Russian Machins—194-245-246-263
- Bebel August* (1840-1913)—a leader of German Social Democrats and of the Second International, opposed revisionism—247
- Belinsky Vissarion Grigoryevich* (1811-1848)—Russian literary critic, publicist, revolutionary democrat—256
- Belov*—see *Plekhanov G. V.*
- Berdyaev Nikolai Alexandrovich* (1874-1948)—Russian theologist from 1905 to 1907, a Cretist, subsequently mystic, philosopher—56-123-225
- Berkeley George* (1685-1753)—English philosopher, subjective idealist, denied objective reality of the world (the world is only my sensations)—23-192-245
- Bernstein Eduard* (1850-1932)—a leader of the extreme opportunist wing of German Social Democrats, theoretician of reformism and revisionism (so-called Bernsteinism). He revised philosophical, economic and political foundations of Marxism, declared the struggle for reforms the sole aim of the working class movement aimed at improving economic position of workers under capitalism—58-63-123-171
- Bismarck Otto Eduard Leopold* (1815-1898)—Chancellor of the German Reich from 1871 to 1890, pursued the policy of strengthening the alliance be-

tween the bourgeoisie and landlords.—54, 163

Bogdanov, A. (Malinovsky, Alexander Alexandrovich) (1873-1928)—Russian philosopher, sociologist and economist, revised philosophy from the Machian viewpoint.—20-21, 23, 263

Böhm-Bawerk, Eugen (1851-1914)—Austrian economist, tried to refute Marx's theory of value and of surplus value.—225

Bonch-Bruyevich, Vladimir Dmitriyevich (1873-1955)—Soviet Party functionary and statesman; from 1917 to 1920, held the post of Business Manager of the Council of People's Commissars.—261

Briand, Aristide (1862-1933)—French politician, at the beginning of his political career adhered to Socialists, later became member of the bourgeois government.—69

Bukharin, Nikolai Ivanovich (1888-1938)—member of the RSDLP (Bolsheviks) from 1906; emigrated abroad in 1911. In 1915 contributed to the journal *Kommunist*, held non-Marxist stand on the questions of state, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the right of nations to self-determination.

After the October Socialist Revolution was the editor of *Pravda*, member of the Political Bureau of the CC, member of the Communist International Executive; continuously opposed Leninist party policy; in 1918 headed the anti-Party group of "Left Communists"; during the discussion on the trade unions (1920-21) held "buffer" position and later joined Trotsky's group; from 1928 headed the Right-wing opposition in the Party. In 1929 was withdrawn

from the Political Bureau of the CC. In 1937, expelled from the RCP (B) for anti-Party activities.—150, 151, 205, 240

C

Chernov, Viktor Mikhailovich (Voroshilov) (1873-1952)—a founder and theorist of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party.—210, 244, 245

Chernyshevsky, Nikolai Gavrilovich (1828-1889)—Russian revolutionary democrat, scientist, writer and literary critic; a leader of revolutionary-democratic movement in Russia in the 1860s. In 1862 was arrested, sentenced to penal servitude and deportation for life to Siberia.—116, 135, 256

Chkhenkeli, Akaky Ivanovich (1874-1959)—a leader of Georgian Mensheviks.—128

Chalyus (5th c. B. C.)—Greek idealist philosopher, disciple of Heraclitus and Plato's teacher.—39

D

Dahl, Vladimir Ivanovich (1801-1871)—Russian lexicographer, physician, writer, ethnographer, compiled "A Defining Dictionary of the Living Russian Language" (in four volumes, 1863-66).—258-59

Danneman, Friedrich (1859-?)—German historian of natural science.—237

Dietzgen, Joseph (1828-1888)—German worker, Social-Democrat, philosopher, independently arrived at dialectical materialism. However, in the theory of knowledge he equated matter and thought, he partially adhered vulgar materialists (brain secretes thought in the

same way as liver bile). Lenin quoted Dietzgen's work "Streifungen eines Sozialisten in das Gebiet der Erkenntnistheorie".—22

Dobrolyubov, Nikolai Alexandrovich (1836-1861)—Russian literary critic, publicist, revolutionary democrat.—135

Dubasov, Fyodor Vasilyevich (1845-1912)—tsarist general, suppressed the December uprising of the Moscow workers in 1905.—55, 243

Dzubinsky, V. I. (1860-1927)—deputy of the Third and Fourth State Dumas from Tobolsk Gubernia.—72

E

Ellenbogen, W. (1863-?)—a revisionist leader of Austrian Social-Democracy.—123

Ephrussi, B. O. (1865-1897)—Russian economist of Narodnik learnings, writer, translator of Swiss economist Sismondi.—185

Epicurus (c. 341-270 B. C.)—Greek materialist philosopher.—39

F

Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas (1804-1872)—German materialist philosopher, atheist.—25, 26, 27

G

Gassendi, Pierre (1592-1655)—French materialist philosopher.—26

Gompers, Samuel (1850-1924)—an opportunist leader of the US trade union movement.—92

Goremykin, Ivan Logginovich (1839-1917)—monarchist, Chairman of the Council of Ministers (1906, 1914-16).—79

Gorgias (5th-4th cent. B.C.)—Greek Sophist. Sophists were

convinced in relativity of all man's notions, ethical norms and evaluations.—37

Gorky (Peshkov), Alexei Maximovich (1868-1936)—Russian and Soviet writer and public figure. From 1908 to 1910 joined so-called Cord-builders (a trend in Russian Social-Democracy who fought to create a new socialist religion).—78, 263, 267

Guchkov, A. I. (1862-1936)—Russian capitalist, a leader of the Octobrist Party.—116

H

Harcourt, William (1827-1904)—British statesman, leader of the Liberal Party.—54, 163

Haym, Rudolf (1821-1901)—German historian of literature and philosophy.—11, 27

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831)—German philosopher, objective idealist; elaborated idealist dialectics which served as one of the theoretical sources of dialectical materialism.—10, 11, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 44

Henderson, Arthur (1863-1935)—an opportunist leader of the Labour Party and the British trade union movement.—92

Heracitus of Ephes (c. 530-470 B. C.)—Greek materialist philosopher, a founder of dialectics.—10

Herzen, Alexander Ivanovich (1812-1870)—Russian revolutionary democrat, materialist philosopher, publicist and writer.—256

Hippocrates (c. 460-377 B. C.)—Greek physician and father of medicine.—41

Hyndman, Henry Mayers (1842-1921)—British politician, foundation member of the British Socialist Party. During the World War I became a social-chauvinist.—80

K

- Kalinin, Mikhail Ivanovich** (1875-1946)—Petrograd worker of peasant origin, Bolshevik. From 1919 Chairman of the Central Executive Committee; from 1936 Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.—239
- Kant, Immanuel** (1724-1804)—idealist philosopher, founder of German classical philosophy; accepted the existence of objective world but considered it to be unrecognisable.—35, 193
- Kasparov, Vladislav Minasovich** (1884-1917)—Russian Social-Democrat, a Bolshevik.—236
- Kautsky, Karl** (1854-1938)—a theorist and leader of German Social-Democracy and the Second International. Author of a series of books in which he expounded and popularised Marx's theory. In 1914, after the World War I broke out, he became a renegade to Marxism and opposed the split with social-chauvinists who supported their imperialist governments in the imperialist war; ideologist of Centrist—a variety of opportunism, which camouflages itself by revolutionary phraseology; after the October Socialist Revolution came out against the Marxist teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Soviet state.—80, 83, 90, 97, 171, 174, 197, 201, 210, 244, 246, 249
- Kerensky, Alexander Fyodorovich** (1881-1970)—Russian politician: in the Fourth Duma (1912-17)—leader of the Trudovik faction. After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution, Minister of Justice in the bourgeois Provisional Government, subsequently Prime Minister.—128, 148
- Kievsky, P. (Pyatakov, George Leonidovich)** (1890-1937)—Russian Social-Democrat; during the war (1914-18) opposed the right of nations to self-determination and the struggle for democracy under imperialism. After the October Socialist Revolution was member of the Soviet Government in the Ukraine, held a number of administrative posts; headed anti-Party group of "Left Communist" in the Ukraine. During the Party discussion on trade unions (1920-21) supported Trotsky's platform. In 1936 was expelled from the Party for anti-Party activities.—83, 84, 156
- Kiesewetter, Alexander Alexandrovich** (1866-1933)—Russian liberal publicist, member of the CC of the Constitutional-Democratic Party.—55, 56, 243
- Kokoshkin, Fyodor Fyodorovich** (1871-1918)—bourgeois politician, publicist, a founder of the Constitutional-Democratic Party.—137
- Konovalov, Alexander Ivanovich** (1875-1948)—big textile manufacturer, Right-wing Cadet.—77
- Kristan, F.** (1867-1953)—a leader of Slovenia's Social-Democrats (Slovenia—region of Yugoslavia, which up to 1918 was part of Austria-Hungary).—123
- Krupskaya, Nadezhda Konstantinovna** (1869-1939)—V. I. Lenin's wife.—264, 265
- Kutler, N. N.** (1859-1924)—a leader of the Constitutional-Democratic Party.—61

L

- Labriola, Antonio** (1843-1904)—Italian philosopher, theorist and propagandist of Marxism.—242
- Lassalle, Ferdinand** (1825-1864)—

German petty-bourgeois socialist — 39

Leibnitz Gottfried Wilhelm (1646-1716)—German philosopher and scientist, objective idealist. His work *Nouveaux Essais sur l'entendement humain* was directed against sensualism according to which the world could be cognised only through senses — 26

Lieber Mikhail Isaakovich (1880-1937)—a Bund leader at the Second RSDLP Congress (1903) held extremely opportunist stand — 227

Lubman F—in active Bund member — 115 116

Lutkens F A (1888-1922)—Deputy Chief of the Chief Committee for Political Education (*Glavpolitprosvet*) in 1920 from 1921 Deputy People's Commissar for Education of the Russian Federation — 259 260 261

Lloyd George David (1863-1945)—a Liberal Party leader was repeatedly British Prime Minister — 69

Lunacharsky Anatoly Vasilievich (1875-1933)—Soviet statesman from 1917 to 1929 People's Commissar for Education — 258 259 263

M

Manyasha — Ulyanova Maria Ilyinichna (1878-1937)—V I Lenin's younger sister — 264 266

Mark — Yelizarov M I (1863-1919)—husband of Anna Ilyinichna Ulyanovna Yelizarov V I Lenin's sister — 266

Martov I (Fiederbaum Yuli Oskopovich) (1873-1923)—Russian Social Democrat leader of an opportunist Menshevik trend in the RSDLP — 51 68 69 163

Martynov Alexander Samoilovich (1863-1935)—Russian Social-Democrat opportunist. During the revolution of 1905-07 opposed revolutionary tactics. Lenin called him wise man and a hysticist — 51 52 227

Mikhailovsky Nikolai Konstantinovich (1842-1904)—Russian sociologist and publicist ideologist of liberal Narodism opposed Marxism from the peasant socialism stand — 45 208 223

Millerand Alexander Etienne (1859-1943)—French politician at the beginning of his political career joined socialists subsequently became a member of the bourgeois government of France — 69

Mikulo Paul Nikolayevich (1859-1913)—leader of the Constitutional Democratic Party ideologist of the Russian bourgeoisie historian and publicist. After the February 1917 bourgeois democratic revolution Foreign Minister of the Provisional Government — 68 72 77

N

Narodovsky M (1866-1943)—Russian Social Democrat publicist during the years of reaction (1907-10)—liquidator — 234

Nicholas II—the last Russian Emperor (1894-1917) — 148

Nikolai-on (Danilov Nikolai Frenich) (1844-1918)—Russian economist ideologist of liberal Narodism translated K Marx's *Capital* into Russian. V I Lenin quote *Manifesto of the Communist Party* by K Marx and F Engels in Danilov's translation — 212

O

Olminsky Mikhail Stepanovich (Vilimsky) (1863-1933)—Russian

Social-Democrat, publicist; from 1911 to 1914 was member of editorial boards of the Bolshevik newspapers *Pravda* and *Zvezda*.—236

Ostwald, Wilhelm Friedrich (1853-1932)—German naturalist and idealist philosopher; author of the "theory of energy" which reduced all natural phenomena to modifications of energy deprived of material substance.—23

P

Parabellum—see *Radek, K. B.*

Petrunkovich, Ivan Ilyich (1843-1928)—big landowner, member of the Constitutional-Democratic Party.—57

Pisarev, Dmitry Ivanovich (1840-1868)—Russian literary critic, materialist philosopher.—43

Plekhanov, Georgi Valentinovich (1856-1918)—an outstanding leader of the Russian and international working-class movement, first propagandist of Marxism in Russia. In 1883 he founded the first Russian Marxist organisation the Emancipation of Labour group in Geneva. In early 1900s he was on the editorial boards of the newspaper *Iskra* and the journal *Zarya*.

From 1883 to 1903 Plekhanov wrote a number of works which greatly contributed to defence and propaganda of materialist world outlook. However, already at that time he was not free from serious mistakes which made the embryo of his future Menshevik views. After the Second Congress of the RSDLP (1903), he assumed a conciliatory attitude towards opportunism, and then joined the Mensheviks. During the first Russian revolution of 1905-07

he held Menshevik stand on all cardinal problems. During the years of reaction and a new revolutionary upsurge he opposed the Machian revision of Marxism and came out against liquidationism, headed the group of pro-Party Mensheviks. During the World War I took a social-chauvinist stand. After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution returned to Russia and headed Yedinstvo, the extreme Right group of the Menshevik defencists; opposed the Bolsheviks and the socialist revolution, maintaining that Russia was not yet ripe for socialism. His attitude towards the October Socialist Revolution was negative, but he did not take part in the struggle against Soviet power.—20, 42, 57, 58, 80, 94, 100, 116, 133, 171, 197, 211, 225, 226, 229, 234, 244-45

Pokrovsky, Mikhail Nikolayevich (1868-1932)—Russian historian; from 1918 Deputy People's Commissar for Education.—259, 260

Postnikov, Vladimir Yefimovich (1844-1908)—Russian economist and statistician, made a research into the process of disintegration of peasantry.—183

Prokopovich, Sergei Nikolayevich (1871-1955)—Russian publicist, one of the first propagandists of Bernsteinism in Russia, author of books on the labour question which he wrote from liberal position.—73, 231

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865)—French publicist and economist; ideologist of petty bourgeoisie. His idea of going back to small-scale production was utopian and reactionary.—118, 144

Purishkevich, Vladimir Mitrofanovich (1870-1920)—big

landowner, monarchist.—72, 74,
77, 108, 116, 121, 134
Pyatakov—see *Kievsky, P.*

R

Radek, Karl Berngardovich (Parabel-lum) (1885-1939)—Russian Social-Democrat, participated in the Social-Democratic movement in Russia, Poland and Germany; internationalist during the World War I, however wavered towards Centrism. Bolshevik from 1917; held a number of responsible Party and government posts; repeatedly came out against Lenin's Party policy: in 1918—Left Communist; from 1923—an active member of Trotsky's opposition; in 1936 was expelled from the Party for factionalism.—145, 267

Radishchev, Alexander Nikolayevich (1749-1802)—Russian writer, revolutionary enlightener; for his book *Travel from Petersburg to Moscow* in which he exposed the serf-owning and autocratic system in Russia he was sentenced to deportation to Siberia.—141, 251

Renan, Joseph Ernest (1823-1892)—French historian, studied history of Christianity.—98

Renner, Karl (1870-1950)—a leader of the Right wing of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party, ideologist of Austro-Marxism.—145

Rey, Abel (1873-1940)—French philosopher, positivist, held Machian stand in the theory of knowledge.—168

Rodichev, F. I. (1853-1932)—big landowner, monarchist.—57

Romanovs—a dynasty of Russian tsars and Emperors who ruled from 1613 till 1917.—66

Rubakin, Nikolai Alexandrovich (1862-1946)—Russian bibliophil

and writer, from 1907 lived in Switzerland. His main work is *Among Books*.—262, 263

Ryazanov, David Borisovich (1870-1938)—Social-Democrat, Menshevik. At the Sixth Congress of the PSDLP (B) (1917) was admitted to the Party. After the October Socialist Revolution was a leading trade union functionary, during the discussion on the trade unions (1920-21) took an anti-Party stand and was dismissed from the work in trade unions. From 1921 was director of the Institute of K. Marx and F. Engels. From February 1931 was expelled from the Party.—227

S

Scheidemann, Philipp (1865-1939)—a leader of the extreme Right, opportunist wing of German Social-Democracy, from 1918 to 1921 an organiser of the bloody suppression of the German workers' movement.—150, 153

Serrati, Giacinto Menotti (1872-1926)—a leader of Italian Socialist Party; in 1924 joined the Italian Communist Party.—130

Sipiyagin, Dmitry Sergiyevich (1853-1902)—Russian reactionary statesman, from 1899 to 1902 Minister of the Interior. In his circular of 1901 he expounds the government programme for aid to gubernias struck by famine.—210

Skaldin, Fyodor Pavlovich (1827-1907)—Russian liberal-bourgeois publicist. Lenin quotes his book *In the Backwoods and in the Capital* for description of Russian enlighteners.—161

Stolyan, Pyotr Arkadyevich (1862-1911)—Russian statesman.

From 1906 to 1911 Chairman of Council of Ministers. His name is connected with the period of violent political reaction.—70

- Struve, Pyotr Berngardovich* (1870-1944)—Russian economist and publicist, came out with "additions" to and "criticism" of Marx's economic and philosophical teaching. On the eve of the 1905-07 bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia was the editor of the journal *Osvobozhdeniye*—the organ of liberal-monarchal opposition. Member of the CC of the Constitutional-Democratic Party which was formed in 1905.—52, 54, 55, 104, 116, 123, 164, 209
- Südekum, Albert* (1871-1944)—Right wing leader of German Social-Democrats.—171

T

- Thiers, Louis-Adolphe* (1797-1877)—French statesman and historian; from 1830 to 1848 repeatedly held ministerial posts. Some days prior to the 1848 February Revolution announced in the Chamber of Deputies that he belonged to the party of revolution. In May 1871 headed the French government; suppressed Paris Commune with exceptional brutality.—54, 164
- Tolstoy, Lev Nikolayevich* (1828-1910)—Russian writer.—135
- Trepov, Dmitry Fyodorovich* (1855-1906)—Russian statesman, suppressed the 1905-07 revolution.—57
- Trotsky, Lev Davidovich* (1879-1940)—Russian Social-Democrat, Menshevik. After the defeat of the 1905-07 revolution during the years of reaction and a new revolutionary upsurge actually held liquidationist stand

trying to conceal it by non-factionalism. In 1912 he organised the anti-Party August bloc; Centrist during the World War I. After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution returned to Russia from emigration and at the Sixth Congress of the RSDLP (B) (1917) was admitted to the Party. However, he did not adopt a Bolshevik position and continued to wage an overt and covert struggle against Leninism, against Party policy.

After the October Socialist Revolution held responsible posts. In 1918 opposed the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty; in 1920-21 an opposition leader in the discussion on trade unions. From 1923 waged factional struggle opposing the Party's general line and Lenin's programme of building socialism in Soviet Russia; upheld the theory of impossibility of victory of socialism in one single country. The Communist Party disclosed Trotskyism as a petty-bourgeois deviation in the Party and smashed it ideologically and organisationally. In 1927 Trotsky was expelled from the Party and in 1929 banished from the USSR for anti-Soviet activities; in 1932 deprived of Soviet citizenship. While living abroad, Trotsky continued his struggle against the Soviet state and the CPSU, against the international communist movement.—68, 205, 206, 240

Turgenev, Ivan Sergeyevich (1818-1883)—Russian writer.—135, 253, 265

U

- Ulyanova, Maria Alexandrovna* (1835-1916)—V. I. Lenin's mother.—264, 265, 266

Ulanova-Yelizarova, Anna Ilyinichna (Anyuta) (1864-1935)—
V. I. Lenin's elder sister—264
265

V

Vatunsky—see Olminsky, M. S.
Voroshilov—see Chernov, V. M.

W

Wilson, Woodrow (1856-1924)—U.S.
President in 1913-21; an organ-
izer of military intervention
against Soviet Russia—153
Witte, Sergei Yulievich (1849

1915)—Russian statesman
Chairman of the Council of
Ministers from 1905 to 1906—
229

Wundt, Wilhelm Max (1832-
1920)—German psychologist,
physiologist and idealist
philosopher—167-193

Y

Yulkevitch, Ica (1885-1918)—
Ukrainian bourgeois na-
tionalist—116

Yulhakov, Sergei Nikolayevich
(1849-1910)—ideologist of
liberal Narodism; sociologist and
publicist—209-10

RADUGA PUBLISHERS

DAVYDOV Yu. Myth, Philosophy, Avant-Gardism. *Philosophic Myths and Avant-garde Literature*

Yuri Davydov, a well-known Soviet sociologist and literary critic, studies in his book the origins of avant-garde literature. He analyses the philosophies of Nietzsche, Freud and Spengler, signifying the crisis of bourgeois humanism, also the theories of Sartre, Marcuse, Adorno and other ideologists of modern Western "post-culture", and shows their logical evolution to the renunciation of progressive spiritual values accumulated by mankind.

The book is addressed to experts in sociology and the philosophy of art.

RADUGA PUBLISHERS

KUZMENKO Yu. *Soviet Literature—Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*

Yu. Kuzmenko, a critic and aesthetician, examines Soviet literature as a living and developing phenomenon, a factor to be reckoned with when speaking of twentieth century world literature. The five chapters of the book focus on the interaction of literature and life and on Soviet literature of the period from the twenties to the seventies. In conclusion the author reflects on the prospects for the development of Soviet literature in the eighties and the nineties.

The book is intended for foreign scholars of Soviet literature.

RADUGA PUBLISHERS

MARKOV D. *Socialist Literature: Problems of Development*

In following the development of Slavonic literatures, D. Markov, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute of Slavonic and Balkan Studies, comes to the conclusion that socialist realism as a method first came to be established in Russian literature. The monograph studies the method of socialist realism in the context of other artistic trends in the twentieth century and shows its role in the world literary process.

